JKM LIBRARY
BX5056.D74
Dowden, John,
Outlines of the history of the theologic
3 9968 02640 9485

al Literature

OF

The Church of England

JOHN DOWDEN, D.D.

I 1 C

LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary
OF THE
Evangelical Lutheran Church
At CHICAGO

Vol.....
Work 5557
Class F-2
Shelf.....

The Bishop Paddock Lectures, 1896–7

OUTLINES OF THE HISTORY

OF THE

THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE

OF

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE CLOSE OF
THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

BY

JOHN DOWDEN, D.D.

BISHOP OF EDINBURGH.

PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE TRACT COMMITTEE.

18754

LONDON:
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE,
NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.;
43, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C.
BRIGHTON: 129, NORTH STREET.
NEW YORK: E. & J. B. YOUNG & CO.

1897.

Richard Clay & Sons, Limited,
London & Bungay.

BX 5056
.D74

To

THE DEAN,

THE PROFESSORS,

AND

THE STUDENTS

OF

The General Theological Seminary,

NEW YORK,

BEFORE WHOM THESE LECTURES

WERE ORIGINALLY DELIVERED,

THEY ARE NOW INSCRIBED

IN GRATEFUL MEMORY OF MUCH KINDNESS.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/theologicallitar0000john

PREFACE

THE design of the following Lectures is to present a sketch of the theological literature of the Church of England from the Reformation to the beginning of the present century. Some general knowledge of the civil and ecclesiastical history of England during the period is assumed; and the lectures are mainly concerned with tracing the growth and changes in religious opinion, indicating the character of the principal works of the more eminent theologians, and in some degree estimating their value.

It has been thought advisable not to extend this sketch beyond the close of the eighteenth century. The writer feels that we are as yet too near the controversies which originated out of the Oxford Movement to be able to judge them dispassionately.

Homiletical literature, unless distinctly contributing to theological science, and works of practical divinity, together with devotional writings, are not considered; hence many eminent names, among which may be mentioned Donne,

South, Ken, Atterbury, and Thomas Wilson, are passed over in silence. But even within the limits prescribed to ourselves, there are omissions which would be culpable in any extended history.

One could have wished to enlarge the scope of these lectures so as to embrace the theologians of the Irish and Scottish Churches. The bearings of ethical and metaphysical speculation upon theology, as exhibited in the writings of Archbishop King, Bishop Berkeley, and Bishop Peter Brown, deserve careful study. And it is with particular regret that I omit any notice of the great John Forbes, of Corse; Bishop William Forbes, first Bishop of Edinburgh, and author of the *Considerationes Modestæ;* and Archbishop Leighton. The consideration of Ussher's writings to be found in the following pages makes no infringement of the rule laid down; for, not to speak of the important part he played in English ecclesiastical affairs, England has the honour of being able to claim him as Bishop of Carlisle.

It has only to be added that several passages which, for the sake of brevity, were omitted in the delivery of the Lectures, are here inserted in their proper places.

THE BISHOP PADDOCK LECTURES

In the summer of the year 1880, George A. Jarvis, of Brooklyn, N.Y., moved by his sense of the great good which might thereby accrue to the cause of Christ, and to the Church of which he was an ever-grateful member, gave to the General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church certain securities, exceeding in value eleven thousand dollars, for the foundation and maintenance of a Lectureship in said seminary.

Out of love to a former pastor and enduring friend, the Right Rev. Benjamin Henry Paddock, D.D., Bishop of Massachusetts, he named the foundation "The Bishop Paddock Lectureship."

The deed of trust declares that—

"*The subjects* of the lectures shall be such as appertain to the defence of the religion of Jesus Christ, as revealed in the *Holy Bible*, and illustrated in the *Book of Common Prayer*, against the varying errors of the day, whether materialistic, rationalistic, or professedly religious, and also to its defence and confirmation in respect of such central truths as the *Trinity*, the *Atonement*, *Justification*, and the *Inspiration of the Word of God;* and of such central facts as the *Church's Divine Order and Sacraments*, her historical *Reformation*, and her rights and powers as a pure and national Church. *And* other subjects may be chosen if unanimously approved by the Board of Appointment as being both timely and also within the true intent of this Lectureship."

Under the appointment of the Board created by the Trust, the Right Reverend John Dowden, D.D., Bishop of Edinburgh, delivered the Lectures for the year 1896-7, contained in this volume.

PADDOCK LECTURES

LECTURE I

The design and scope of these Lectures—The controversy with Rome in the sixteenth century—Theological learning of the first reformers—The three most eminent of the anti-Roman controversialists of the sixteenth century: Cranmer, Jewel, Bilson; their principal writings—Hooker's attitude towards Rome—Controversies on the versions of the Scriptures.

DURING the three centuries and a half that separate us from the Anglican Reformation of the sixteenth century the scholars and divines of the Church of England have bequeathed to us what has come to be a large and varied literature. This literature ranges over divers fields of thought, theological and ecclesiastical. It is rich in works marked by scholarship, by wide learning, by acuteness of intellectual perception, by close and sustained argument, by breadth of speculative power, by practical sagacity, by the spirit of fervent devotion. Indeed, if due allowances be made, it may be fairly questioned whether the learning and piety of

any Christian Church has, during a like period, produced a larger number of monumental works of human genius in its search for, and in its defence of, sacred truth.

It is only fair to remember that for a long period of her history the English Church was in numbers a very small community. And the proportion of men in any community endowed with exceptional aptitude for research, or with exceptional powers of reasoning, or of exposition, is, in truth, a matter of averages.

Again, it must not be forgotten that the conditions of life in the Church of England have in some important respects been less favourable to the cultivation of sacred learning than those existent elsewhere. The Universities and the Cathedral establishments made but a limited and partial exception to the truth that opportunities for learned leisure have been few in England. The retirement and freedom from secular distractions afforded to individual scholars by some of the monastic orders on the Continent were no longer to be enjoyed in the reformed Church. Nor did she possess any of those religious communities where fellowship in labour and continuity of corporate life made possible such vast undertakings in the fields of historical and patristic research, as we find in the labours of the Bollandists and of the Benedictines of St. Maur. In the reformed Church of England, with rare exceptions, each man stood alone:

his learning died with him, and there was no one, trained at his side, to take up and carry on his special labours.

In certain departments of sacred learning one must frankly acknowledge the limitations, nay, the great void spaces in Anglican literature. Yet any Church in the world might be proud to claim among her sons such scholars and thinkers as Jewel, Hooker, Andrewes, Ussher, Hammond, Cudworth, Taylor, Pearson, Barrow, Bull, Waterland, Beveridge, and Butler—not to enumerate here other great, though lesser, names.

In the present course of lectures little more can be attempted than to trace the outlines and main highways in a wide-spread region of the world of letters, to indicate the road which the student may best follow, and to call attention to the objects along his route that seem more especially deserving of attention.

Notwithstanding all the evils attendant upon religious controversy—and they are many—it is impossible not to recognize the fact that it has been under the pressure of controversy that most of the great achievements of theological literature have had their origin. It was so in the age of the early Christian Apologists. It was so in the age of the great Councils. Even in mediæval times—the so-called "ages of faith"—not only was theology, in its philosophic aspects,

the actual battle-ground of contending schools, but the chief examples of the systematizing of dogma were built up in the controversial form, and grew out of the controversial method. Thus the *Summa* of Aquinas exhibits each Article with its thesis followed by a *Sed contra* (detailing objections few or many), followed in turn by the author's *Respondeo*, in which each objection is successively answered. It was through controversy thought was given clearness of definition, and precision was effected. And, similarly, in the modern epoch it has been the keen stimulant of controversy that has impelled the greatest theologians to their labours of research, of critical examination, of reasoned argument.

The shelves of great libraries give a resting-place to a vast quantity of printed matter in the form of popular expositions of doctrine, devotional treatises, treatises on practical religion, sermons and homiletical discourses, which have issued from the press from the Reformation to our own day. These, it need scarcely be said, are of varied character and very much varied merit. We possess, for example, sermons such as those of Andrewes, of Sanderson, of Thomas Jackson, of Bull, and of Barrow, which are of real theological importance, and marked by learning, exact thought, and speculative power. Occasionally, too, men of genius have made discourses from the pulpit a vehicle for

the expression of thought, so clothed with grace and beauty of style, so illuminated with the play of imagination, so fired and coloured by the glow of emotion, that their utterances have been given a permanent place in the general literature of our country. Bossuet and Massillon have scarcely a more honoured position in the literature of France than Donne and Taylor in the literature of England. To be ignorant of these is scarcely less discreditable than to be ignorant of Bacon and Addison. But for our present purpose it is only so far as it has made a contribution to theological science that literature of this kind can claim our attention: pulpit oratory, as such, will not occupy us.

Those branches of sacred learning which are concerned with pure biblical criticism and exegesis, and with the independent investigation of the history and antiquities of the Church, must doubtless be assigned a place—a very important place—in any adequate estimate of the labours of Anglican Churchmen. But though they are well deserving of a full treatment, in the present course of lectures it is impossible to do more than bestow upon them a hurried glance. We shall here be mainly engaged in considering what more properly belongs to dogmatic theology and the defence of the Anglican position.

The main lines along which our leading theologians moved and laboured were three in

number; and into each of them they were directed and compelled by the exigencies of the hostile attacks against the doctrine and constitution of the Church. First, in order of time, and chief, if we consider the long-continued persistence of the assault, was the controversy forced upon the Church of England by Rome. Next, in succession and historical importance, came the large body of literature that was issued in defence of the Church's constitution against the attacks of the Puritan party. Lastly, the Church was called upon to defend the primary and essential fundamentals of the faith against assaults from the side of unbelief. These last-named assaults were put forward in definite shape in the seventeenth century. In the eighteenth century they became more general and more daring. In our own time unbelief has pushed its attack further, and assailed not only Revelation, but even the belief in a Personal God. Each line of attack and defence has its own separate history, and its own varying fortunes.

The controversy with Rome began in its literary form from the moment that the Church of England was called upon to justify her position as now separated from the organization of the most powerful religious community of Christendom. It touched the centre of English politics; it occupied almost the whole field of religious thought in England during the reigns

of Edward and Mary, and the greater part of that of Elizabeth. It continued to be active and animated in the years of James I. and Charles I., when every theologian of distinction was more or less engaged in the struggle. It again occupied all thoughts when in the days of James II. Englishmen were roused by the aggressive Romeward movement of the King and his adherents. There was a change in the eighteenth century. When the Revolution of 1688 had freed England from the dangers that loomed large and threatening in the past, the country gradually settled down to an easy, contented, and yet most dangerous, because unintelligent, Protestantism. Men ceased to thoroughly understand the questions at issue; and Rome was contemptuously regarded as intellectually bankrupt. The eighteenth century and the earlier years of the present century added nothing of significance to anti-Roman polemics. But by the middle of the present century England was awakened out of her dream; and since then the old controversy, under somewhat altered conditions, has again come to the front, and is, beyond question, destined to occupy much thought for many years to come.

In the sixteenth century the English Reformers had been led by different routes first to question, and then to repudiate the claims of the Papacy

to ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the realm of England. This movement of thought, which was largely coloured by political considerations, was soon followed by a growing conviction that much of the doctrinal teaching of Rome was no part of the faith once delivered to the saints. Many of the most cherished of the authoritative dogmas of the Church of Rome were deliberately rejected; and English theologians were called upon to justify their action in the face of the Christian world.

Among the ecclesiastical leaders of the time were some well qualified for their task. They had received in full measure the best training that the Universities of the day could supply. Several of them had early attained eminence by their abilities and learning. They had been sedulously trained in the system and methods of the Schoolmen, which, however defective in other respects, supplied an admirable discipline for quickening the perception of intellectual distinctions and for exercising the powers of dialectical discussion. They had been made thoroughly familiar with the nice intricacies of scholastic theology, and with the methods of argument on which they were supported. Some of them had, in addition, felt the animating breath of the "New Learning"; but they were men who from their youth had been versed in the "Old." It is a mistake begotten of ignorance to suppose that in their theological pro-

nouncements they dealt merely, or even chiefly, with popular misconceptions and popular superstitions. They had full in view the authoritative teaching of the recognized doctors of the then prevailing mediæval theology. **Latimer**, whom we are wont to remember chiefly for the vigorous and homely English of his popular sermons, had been a Fellow of Clare Hall, noted more especially for his intimate acquaintance with the system of Duns Scotus, the "*Doctor subtilis*" of the Schools. His Latin discourses *ad clerum* were thronged by scholars, even as his English sermons were afterwards thronged by the general public. **Ridley**, who in 1524 had to make choice between a Fellowship at University College, Oxford, and a Fellowship at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, was so eager in the pursuit of learning that he, soon after, crossed the Channel, and devoted some two or three years to study in Paris at the renowned school of the Sorbonne. Before the breach with Rome his position as a man of learning in the University of Cambridge was well established. **Cranmer** was from the outset of his career a student of a very thorough kind, "seldom reading without pen in hand," and leaving us note-books which to this day testify to his extensive research and careful observation. He was a student of Hebrew as well as of Greek. When Wolsey desired to plant in his new and splendid foundation at Oxford "the ripest and solidest

sort of scholars," Cranmer, a Cambridge man, who had been a Fellow of Jesus College in that University as early as 1510, was pressed to accept at "Cardinal College" a lucrative and honourable place. At a later time "his library was the storehouse of ecclesiastical writers of all ages"; as, indeed, is testified by the large number of volumes that can still be traced.[1] These men and others among the leaders of the Reformation movement were, beyond question, men of no ordinary attainments, and exceptionally well versed in the learning of their day.[2]

Setting aside the question as to the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome, which had already received in England a practical solution, no inquiries so largely occupied the minds of English theologians as those which bore upon the doctrine of the Eucharist. This question was made from time to time the subject of public conferences and disputations. It was not merely a matter of scholastic interest; it

[1] See Mr. Burbidge's careful attempt to construct a catalogue of the remaining volumes, in his work on the *Liturgies and Offices of the Church.*

[2] Compare on this subject the words of the late Archbishop (Benson) of Canterbury in his *Fishers of Men* (p. 125), where, after expressing his high estimate of the learning of the Reformers, he adds, with a touch of very legitimate scorn,— "yet dabbling books, with less taint of learning about them than have ever issued from writers of the English Church, daily assume that the least in the pre-Reformation days were greater than they."

touched the religious life of the nation. And to the defence of the Church of England's change of teaching on this subject the most important of Cranmer's writings are devoted.

The gradual modifications in the Archbishop's views of the Eucharist are a matter of history. We shall concern ourselves here only with those published works which set forth his matured judgment, and which, as a matter of fact, represent substantially the prevailing doctrine of Anglican theologians down to our own day.

In 1550 Cranmer printed a quarto volume, entitled "A defence of the true Catholic doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ; with a confutation of sundry errors concerning the same; grounded and established upon God's Holy Word, and approved by the consent of the most ancient doctors of the Church."[1] The very title-page of the book, it will be observed, gave expression to the great principle of the English Reformation, that it is to Holy Scripture we must look for the ground of doctrine, while the testimony of the early Church is given a valued place in confirmation of the inferences drawn from Scripture. Worthy, too, of observation is the

[1] This will be found embodied (in detached paragraphs) in Cranmer's *Answer* to Gardiner, and in a continuous form in the Latin translation (1557) generally attributed to Sir John Cheke. Both are given in Cranmer's *Works* (P. S. edit.).

distinct challenge of the title that the doctrine maintained is the *Catholic* doctrine. From the outset the reformed Church declined to concede that term to mediæval superstitions.[1]

The principle of the supreme authority of Holy Scripture had already been maintained in a treatise, commonly, though, perhaps, incorrectly, attributed to Cranmer, and entitled *A Confutation of "Unwritten Verities,"* i. e. a confutation of Smith's work, "*De veritatibus non scriptis.*"[2] But, whether the work be Cranmer's or not, the principle is clearly set forth in the fifth of the Articles of Religion of 1553 (which corresponds, with some slight modifications, with the sixth of our XXXIX. Articles), not improbably written by Cranmer's pen. It is scarcely possible to overrate the importance of the great principle of the ultimate authority and sufficiency of Holy Scripture. In the past it lifted from men's minds a heavy burden of folly and superstition. It was, and is, an emancipating energy. So long as this principle is not lost sight of, so long as men turn reverently and studiously to examine the teaching of the New

[1] "So eager was the demand for the work that in the same year (1550) three impressions of it appeared."—Todd's *Life of Archbishop Cranmer*, ii. 237.

[2] The question as to the authorship will be found discussed in Cranmer's *Remains* (P. S. edit.). The translation by "E. P.," through which the work is best known, did not appear till Queen Mary's time.

Testament, there is little fear of any wide doctrinal aberrations in this direction or in that. The scholarly study of the Scriptures is the source of a potent *vis medica* that cannot fail to disintegrate and scatter those morbid growths in belief which have a tendency to recur from time to time, and which are not unknown among ourselves.

Cranmer's "Defence of the true Catholic doctrine of the Sacrament" immediately called forth replies from the Roman party, and notably one from Stephen Gardiner.[1] As the work of a man of learning and ability, who had occupied a high station, as Bishop of Winchester, this treatise more especially called for an answer; and in 1551 appeared Cranmer's elaborate rejoinder—"An answer unto a crafty and sophistical cavillation devised by Stephen Gardiner, Doctor of Law, late Bishop of Winchester."[2] This was the most considerable work that had yet come from the pen of any of the English Reformers. It is written in a clear and forcible English style, singularly free from the Latinisms that sometimes disfigured the prose of the period. Cranmer's method is first to print a section of his

[1] *An explication and assertion of the true Catholic faith touching the blessed Sacrament of the Altar, with the confutation of a book written against the same.* This work was printed in France. Gardiner was a prisoner at the time of its appearance.

[2] Another edition appeared in 1552.

earlier work, the *Defence*, then to give in full in Gardiner's own language his comments on that section, and, lastly, his own reply to those comments; and so throughout, section after section. This method, though manifestly fair to his opponent, may be felt somewhat wearisome by modern readers. Yet on those who have the patience to read the whole the impression made is deep and lasting. The ability with which Gardiner had conducted his case cannot be questioned. His reputation, it is true, was greater as a canonist than as a theologian; but in this work he had the advantage of assistance from others, and his own skill is manifest throughout. Indeed, in some of the side issues and details of the controversy, Gardiner seems to me to have the best of the argument. But Cranmer is triumphant in disposing of the attempt to identify the teaching of the English Reformers with the views that were then spoken of as those of the "Sacramentaries," and have since, whether rightly or wrongly, been commonly referred to as "Zwinglian." What seems to me of most importance to observe is that what has been, with few exceptions, the Eucharistic doctrine of the great body of the best Anglican divines is found clearly formulated and fully expounded in the writings of Archbishop Cranmer. There has been, indeed, but little added to the treatment of the controversy with Rome upon the Eucharist since the discussion conducted by

Gardiner and Cranmer. The sense of the same passages of Scripture, the sense of the same quotations from the Fathers, are still in dispute. The argument took into account all the nice distinctions with which technical theologians delight to adorn their pages. It was a contest between experts. The phraseology, of which much has been made of late, as to a body being "present not locally," as to a body being "present in a spiritual manner," and such like, were all well known to, and discussed by, the disputants of the sixteenth century. Similarly, with regard to the "sacrifice of the mass," Cranmer expressly notices the contention of the Romanists that they never claim to make a new sacrifice or any other than Christ made. Gardiner declared that it was "a mere blasphemy" to presuppose that the sacrifice of Christ "once consummate in perfection" should be reiterated. These points are noticed here to disabuse the minds of any who may have been led to fancy that the English Reformers were dealing only with the crude, popular, and unauthorized notions of the vulgar of their day. On the contrary, they were thoroughly familiar with, and thoroughly versed in, the minute and subtle distinctions of the accomplished theologians of the time.

It has been sometimes alleged that **Ridley** differed from Cranmer's views—I mean his *later* views—on the Eucharist. After a careful examination of the writings of both, I am unable to

discover any appreciable difference. And it may be advantageous to exhibit here, from an historical view-point, a summary of the doctrine of these two theologians—the master spirits of the Reformation theology. For our purpose the following seven propositions may suffice—

1. The substance of the bread and wine remain after consecration.

2. The consecrated bread and wine are called the Body and Blood of Christ because they are the appointed signs, or sacraments, of that Body and Blood.

3. They are not "bare signs"; they are "effectual signs" (*efficacia signa*); for, through the almighty power of God, on their due reception the worthy receiver is verily and indeed made partaker of the Body and Blood of Christ.

4. The Body and Blood of Christ is to be sought not in the bread and wine, but in the worthy receiver of them. Christ is no more *in* the bread and wine than the Holy Spirit is *in* the water of baptism.[1]

5. When it is said that the Body and Blood of Christ are in the worthy receiver, what is meant is that "the force, the grace, the virtue and benefit of Christ's Body that was crucified for us, and His Blood that was shed for us, be really and effectually present" in him.

[1] The often cited words of Hooker (*E. P.* V. lxvii. 6, Keble's edit.) will be found substantially anticipated in Cranmer's *Answer* (P. S. p. 52).

6. The wicked do not eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ in any other sense than that they eat and drink the signs, or sacraments, which are called by their names.

7. The sacrament of the Eucharist is called a sacrifice, primarily because it is a representation, commemoration, memorial of the sacrifice of Calvary; and, also, in a secondary sense, as being an offering of our praise and thanksgiving, including the offering unto God of ourselves and all that we have.

Having thus briefly exhibited the doctrine of Cranmer and Ridley, I would call attention to the emphasis with which Cranmer asserts that the worthy receiver "truly" and "indeed" eats and drinks Christ's Body and Blood.[1]

Ridley, with no less emphasis, employs the phrase *vere et realiter* of the presence of Christ's Body and Blood to the worthy receiver.[2]

Similarly Bishop Hooper, one of the most extreme and determined of the opponents of the Roman dogma, declared—"We do *verily and indeed* receive His Body and Blood."[3] I do not trouble you to inquire in what sense these terms were used; I would only point out that language to be found in that part of the Church Catechism which was added in 1604 was used by the first Reformers; and that therefore it

[1] See *Answer*, p. 87 (P. S.).
[2] *Works*, p. 274 (P. S.).
[3] *Later Writings*, p. 49 (P. S.).

is impossible to infer from the use of such language that the Catechism teaches any doctrine incompatible with the views held by Cranmer, Ridley, and Hooper. Here we may perceive one of the subsidiary gains to be derived from the study of the early writers of the Reformed Church: we are by it saved from putting a construction, not necessarily intended, upon the language of our Church's formularies.

The literary history of the controversy between Cranmer and Gardiner does not end with the *Answer* of the former. Gardiner rejoined in 1552, under the assumed name of Marcus Antonius Constantius, in a Latin treatise which bore the truculent title *Confutatio cavillationum quibus Sacrosanctum Eucharistiæ Sacramentum ab impiis Capharnaitis impeti solet.* In 1554, when a second edition appeared, the altered circumstances of the realm led Gardiner to discard the pseudonym, and add "Authore Stephano, Winton Episcopo, Angliæ Cancellario." It is said that Cranmer had made preparations for a further reply when he was at once and for ever effectively silenced by a cruel death.

Beside his controversial treatises we owe to Cranmer's pen certainly one, and not improbably three, of the discourses which appeared in the First Book of Homilies (1547). In the homily which is universally acknowledged to be his, that entitled "Of the Salvation of Man by only

Christ our Saviour," we have an able attempt to expound the doctrine of justification by faith, and to save it from the imputation of antinomian consequences.[1] The other homilies commonly assigned to the authorship of the Archbishop are those entitled "Of a true, lively, and Christian faith," and "Of good works annexed unto faith." They are certainly written in much the same style as his undoubted discourse, and carry on the same line of thought.[2]

[1] This homily must be identified with the homily referred to in the Articles of Religion (Article xi.) as "the homily of Justification"; and thus carries not only the general commendation expressed in Article xxxv., but a special commendation of its own.

[2] Though it does not come within the strict scope of these Lectures, it may be permitted to ask for recognition of the services rendered to religion by Cranmer's promotion of the study of the Scriptures (see his Preface to the English Bible of 1540), and, still more, by his wisdom and literary skill in rendering and adapting the Latin service-books to the use of the Reformed Church. Except as regards the Litany, we may be unable to assign his exact personal share in the work, but his superintending eye was over all. Here and there (as, for example, in the cases of the Collect for the Sunday after Ascension Day and the Collect for the Fourth Sunday in Advent) an important point has been missed or perverted; but, taken as a whole, the English Prayer-book is indeed a priceless heritage. The late Dean Burgon scarcely exaggerated the truth when he wrote that "in countless instances they [the Reformers] have transfused the curtest, baldest, and darkest of the Latin collects into truly harmonious and transparent English." See my article

The persecution in which Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley suffered death, drove many of their followers from their native land. Among the exiles was **John Jewel** (1522—1571), sometime Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

From his youth Jewel had been an indefatigable student. It is recorded of him that in his Oxford days his practice was to rise at four of the clock, and to continue his studies with but little intermission till ten at night. His culture was wide in its extent. The Greek and Latin classics, philosophy, and mathematics had each occupied his attention. But at an early period of his life he began a study of St. Augustine, which was in after years followed by an acquaintance with the whole range of patristic literature.

On his escape from England Jewel is found at Frankfort, where he took the side of Dr. Cox and the other defenders of the use of the English Prayer-book. From Frankfort he proceeded to Strassburg, and, later on to Zurich, being in both places the guest of Peter Martyr. In these days of banishment it was his practice every afternoon to read aloud to his host the works of the ancient Fathers. During the time of exile he was thus quietly laying up the stores of learning which he afterwards employed with such effect.

At the close of 1558 Queen Mary died, and Jewel at once returned to his native land, a

on "Literary Aspects of Prayer-book Revision" in the *Contemporary Review*, vol. xviii. pp. 267—283.

strong man well equipped. It was not long before he made his presence felt. On November 26, 1559, he preached his famous "Challenge Sermon" at Paul's Cross.[1] The contention of this remarkable discourse was that the Church of England, in the points on which she differed from the Church of Rome, had Christian antiquity on her side. It avoided theological speculations. Its method was historical. In its amplified form the "Challenge" laid down twenty-seven propositions, relating mostly to the Eucharist and Roman usages in the celebration of the mass; and then the preacher declared—"If any learned man of all our adversaries, or if all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring one sufficient sentence out of any old catholic Doctor, or Father, or out of any old General Council, or out of the Holy Scriptures of God," whereby any one of these twenty-seven propositions "may be clearly and plainly proved," then "I am content to yield unto him and subscribe."[2] It is unnecessary here to recount the propositions laid down as incapable of support from the testimonies of the ancient

[1] After Jewel's consecration as Bishop of Salisbury, this sermon, with the "Challenge" amplified, was repeated before the Court (March 17, 1560), and a fortnight later once again before a general auditory at Paul's Cross.

[2] The twenty-seven propositions may be found in Jewel's *Works* (P. S.), vol. i. pp. 20, 21 (see also p. 103); in Collier's *Ecclesiastical History*, vi. 293; Cardwell's *Documentary Annals*, i. 254.

Church. It will suffice, if as specimens the two following are given—"That the accidents, or forms, or shews of bread and wine be the sacraments of Christ's Body and Blood, and not rather the very bread and wine itself;" and again, "that the sacrament is a sign or token of the Body of Christ that lieth hidden underneath it."

The gauntlet flung down by Jewel was taken up first by Henry Cole (who had been Dean of St. Paul's in Queen Mary's time), and afterwards by Thomas Harding, a man of considerable learning and much ability, who had formerly been a Fellow of New College, and Professor of Hebrew, in the University of Oxford, and was now at Louvain, where he had the assistance of many capable Roman Catholic theologians. Jewel replied to both antagonists; and the exhaustive examination of Harding's *Answer* (1564) occupies a considerable part of two large volumes of the Parker Society's edition of Jewel's *Works*.[1]

The title-page of the "Challenge Sermon" bears upon it two mottoes which set forth the central thought—the appeal to antiquity. First stands the sentence from Tertullian, "Præjudi-

[1] In the reign of Edward VI. Harding had been violent on the side of the Reformers. More particularly he assailed "the paper walls and painted fires of purgatory," and "wished his voice had been equal to the great bell of Osney that he might ring in the dull ears of the deaf Papists." See Overall's "Dedication," prefixed to the folio editions (1609 and 1611) of Jewel's *Works*.

catum est adversus omnes hæreses : id est verum quodcunque primum ; id est adulterum quodcunque posterius ; " and then follows the familiar clause of the Nicene canon, ἔθη ἀρχαῖα κρατεῖτο. And, whatever may now be thought of the success of Jewel's challenge as regards every particular of his series of propositions, the general principle of the appeal to antiquity, and (to be consistent with Tertullian's dictum) to the *earliest* antiquity, has been commonly adopted and urged by the greatest Anglican divines. In the days of Jewel the so-called " theory of development " had not been devised, and Rome was then as eager as England to claim the testimony of antiquity on her behalf. But neither in this nor in his subsequent discussions does Jewel ever swerve from the position that the Holy Scriptures are the ultimate standard of doctrine. The Fathers may help in guiding us to the sense of Scripture, but it is in that light we must regard them. *Non sunt domini sed duces nostri.*

The " Challenge Sermon " was followed in 1562 by the work of Jewel with which his name and fame are most commonly associated, and which has taken the place of a classic in the literature of English theology—the *Apologia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ.* This small treatise, which the author describes as " a little book in the Latin tongue, . . . containing the whole substance of the catholic faith, now professed and freely preached in England," immediately

attracted general attention. It was translated into English,[1] Italian, Spanish, French, German, Greek, and Welsh, and in its original Latin form it was republished on the Continent. It was the first clear and full statement of the faith of the reformed Church of England ; and the English Church did not hesitate to submit it to the judgment of the world. But no testimony to the importance attached at the time to this work can be so impressive as this, that the Council of Trent is said to have appointed two learned prelates to furnish a reply to it—a reply, it may be added, which never saw the light.

The first part of the Apology claims that the Church of England "has returned to the Apostles and the old catholic Fathers," in opposition to the Roman contention that she had lapsed into heresy. The second part sets forth the essential faith of the Church of England, following the lines of the Nicene Creed on the subjects of the Trinity and the Incarnation. He goes on to assert the independence of the national Church, denying that the Bishop of Rome hath any more jurisdiction over the Church at large than

[1] By Lady Anne Bacon, wife of the Lord Keeper, and mother of Lord Chancellor Bacon. This learned lady sent a copy of her translation to Jewel, accompanied with a letter in Greek. According to Strype (*Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, i. 357) an English version had appeared as early as 1562. The translation of Lady Bacon appeared in 1564, with a commendatory letter from the pen of Archbishop Parker.

the Patriarch of Antioch, or the Patriarch of Alexandria. We receive all the canonical Scriptures. They are "the very sure and infallible rule whereby may be tried whether the Church doth stagger or err, and whereunto all ecclesiastical doctrines ought to be called to account." It is unnecessary to follow in detail Jewel's further statement of the Anglican position, and his telling replies to Roman objections. It must suffice here to cite his answer to those who were then urging—even as certain persons have ever since been wont to urge—the evils of religious strife. "To have peace with man we will not be at war with God. 'Sweet indeed is the name of peace,' saith Hilary, 'but peace,' saith he, 'is one thing, *bondage* is another.'" And entirely appropriate to some schemes for reunion with Rome, which have been ventilated in our own day, are the words of Jewel, where he declares that the Bishop of Rome will make no other league with us than such as, of old time, Nahash, king of the Ammonites, would make with the men of Jabesh. "On this condition will I make a covenant with you, *that I may thrust out all your right eyes.*"

As it had been in the case of the "Challenge Sermon," so now in the case of the "Apology," among several inferior antagonists the able and zealous Harding stands out pre-eminent in his *Confutation* (1565). Jewel found in Harding a foeman worthy of his steel; and in the elaborate

Defence of the Apology we find Jewel at his best. It is a work which displays great powers of argument and an extraordinary wealth of patristic learning.[1] The struggle between the two combatants was carried on with a keenness and persistence to which there is no parallel in recent times. Point after point is fought with a vigour and determination that may well excite wonder. Harding's violent and ferocious invective, touched as it would seem with something of personal animosity, is not in his case a sign of weakness; but it contrasts unfavourably with the prevailing self-possession and dignity of Jewel, who is but seldom betrayed into returning railing for railing, contenting himself with exhibiting, with sarcastic humour, in the forefront of his book, long lists of the choicest specimens of his antagonist's scurrility, which he entitles "Principal Flowers of M. Harding's Modest Speech."[2]

It may be frankly admitted that in this prolonged debate, Jewel, as well as his opponent, misses at times the sense of the authors whom

[1] The rather perplexing bibliography of the various stages of the controversy is discussed in the Preface to Dr. Jelf's edition of Jewel, and in the Parker Society's edition, iv., p. xxvii.

[2] Such as "thieves," "liars," "apostates," "limbs of Antichrist," "Satan's brood," "Bark until your bellies break, ye hell-hounds of Zuinglius, and Luther's litter," "Rail until your tongues burn in your heads in hell fire," etc., etc.

he cites, and at times alleges authorities that will not sustain the weight of argument he constructs upon them. Both combatants, again, were exposed to the danger of quoting as genuine, writings which, in the light of more information and a keener criticism, have since been questioned, discredited, or set aside as spurious. Other errors incident to the scholarship of the period can hardly be reckoned as discreditable. Thus, when Jewel rightly refuses to acknowledge the *Apostolical Constitutions* to be the work of St. Clement of Rome (as Harding had alleged), he puts forward among his reasons for so doing, one that must now be abandoned. "The reader, be he never so simple," writes Jewel, "cannot believe that a Bishop of Rome wrote his books in Greek and not in Latin."[1] Jewel, again, fights hard for the truth of the mediæval story of "Pope Joan." But whatever may now be thought of this curious legend (and the last word has not yet been said), it was certainly no Protestant invention, but had obtained general credence for many years before the Reformation; indeed, it would seem that it had never been seriously questioned till the time of Luther. With much less excuse, for the forgery had been amply exposed, Harding accepts as genuine the "Donation of Constantine," and makes much of it in his argument.

It was all but inevitable at the time, but it

[1] *Works* (P. S.), i. pp. 108 and 111.

is, nevertheless, a sad feature of these early debates, that both parties sought to widen rather than diminish the breach between them. Every difference is amplified and insisted on. Even on questions where a little mutual explanation would have shown that there was no irreconcilable contrariety, the desire seems to have been to emphasize every smallest divergence of expression. A better spirit in this respect showed itself, as we shall see, in many of the controversialists of the next century; indeed, before the close of the sixteenth century it is apparent in Hooker.

But whatever may be the deficiencies or occasional errors of Jewel in detail, his *Defence of the Apology* is indeed a great work, and, taken as a whole, is a masterly and triumphant vindication of the Anglican position.[1]

Jewel was certainly the most learned theologian who had yet appeared in the reformed Church of England; and from his copious stores later controversialists have freely drawn. It would be wearisome to quote the numerous testimonies to his commanding powers. It may suffice if we recite two—first, the words of a great contemporary, and then those of a capable and judicious critic of recent times. "Jewel," wrote

[1] As late as 1610, Archbishop Bancroft directed that every parish should procure a copy of Jewel's collected *Works*—the folio printed by Norton (1609). See Cardwell's *Documentary Annals*, ii. 127.

Hooker, "was the worthiest divine that Christendom hath bred for some hundreds of years."[1] Not *England* only, but *Christendom;* it is a bold utterance, but he would be presumptuous who would lightly declare it to be extravagant. From our own century we draw the second testimony. "Jewel," wrote a competent judge,[2] "was a man of matchless learning, which he nevertheless wields, ponderous as it is, like a plaything; of a most polished wit; a style, whether Latin or English, the most pure and expressive, such as argues a precision in the character of his ideas, and a lucid order in the arrangement of them, quite his own." Certainly, the writings of no private doctor of the Church of England have so nearly attained the authoritative position of symbolical books.[3]

Jewel died in 1571, before he had attained the age of fifty. Shortly before his death, the battle between England and Rome, which had previously extended along the whole line of controversy, became suddenly concentrated to a single point, around which the struggle lasted for some years, and which continued to be a

[1] *E. P.* II. vi. 4.

[2] J. J. Blunt (afterwards Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge) in his *Sketch of the Reformation in England*, p. 305.

[3] The esteem in which Jewel was held by a long succession of our great divines, of all schools, is exhibited in the *Quarterly Review*, vol. lxix. 476–7.

frequent topic of discussion till well on into the next century. In the year 1570, Pope Pius V. published the Bull, *Regnans in excelsis*, in which he excommunicated Queen Elizabeth, and pronounced her deprived of any pretended right to the kingdom of England, and every other dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever. By the same Bull, her subjects were absolved from their allegiance, and commanded, under penalty of anathema, not to presume to yield obedience to any of her laws or commands. The civil consequences of this act of the Pope do not here concern us; but there was brought immediately into prominence a question for the theologians—"Does the Pope possess the right to depose civil rulers?"

One of the last, if not the very last, of Jewel's writings, was a careful examination of the text of the papal pronouncement. After his manner, he examines it clause by clause, and considers not only the reasons alleged for the condemnation of the Queen, but, what is much more important, the value of the claim to authority for pronouncing it.

The reign of Elizabeth was marked by a series of political intrigues, designed and promoted by the Romanists. It was, indeed, only natural that Romanists should look with grief upon the alienation of England; and it was not to be wondered at that they made desperate

efforts for the recovery of the country to papal subjection. In 1568 William Allen, afterwards Cardinal, a man of learning and untiring energy, founded at Douai a college designed for the education of Englishmen for the priesthood. The students were pledged to return, if required, to England for the conversion of the heretics. The college at Douai (subsequently removed to Rheims) became a centre of literary activity, vehemently hostile to the Anglican Church. Controversial books were there printed and secretly transmitted to England. By and by Jesuits, and "seminary priests," as they were called, who had been trained at Douai or Rheims, made their way across the Channel, and, at the risk of their lives and liberties, aided in dispersing the literature of the Roman party. Replies to this literature occupied the attention of several of the English divines. The stringent laws against "popish recusants," and against the seminarists and Jesuits, needed to be supplemented by a reasoned defence of the English Church. The deliberate design to assassinate the Queen, promoted, as it appears, by Parsons and Allen (afterwards rewarded for his zeal on behalf of his faith with a cardinal's hat) only established more firmly the detestation of Rome in the hearts of the English people. But these things set men thinking on the justice of the Pope's claim to the right of deposing princes. Further, any disposition there may have been to

show some measure of indulgence to Roman Catholics was enormously embarrassed by the currency of the belief that the Pope would absolve from the obligations of the most solemn oath of allegiance. The questions thus raised were investigated with much care and great ability by a theologian to whom the Church of England is indebted, as we shall afterwards see, for more than one important contribution to sacred learning. This was **Thomas Bilson**, then Warden of Winchester, and afterwards Bishop, successively, of Worcester and of Winchester, who in 1585 published the volume entitled *The True Difference between Christian Subjection and un-Christian Rebellion.*[1] This work discusses at length the religious basis of the mutual relations of civil rulers and their subjects, and deals more particularly (Part III.) with the reasons alleged by Allen (in his *Defence of English Catholics*) in support of the Pope's right and power to deprive princes. The Pope's claim to this power has never, it is true, been repudiated or formally withdrawn; but the comparative insignificance of the Papacy of recent times, as a factor in the politics of nations, gives the controversy in our eyes a somewhat remote and old-world air. Yet, we must remember, the controversy was in the highest sense vital and practical in the England of Elizabeth.

[1] Oxford, 4to. A second edition appeared in 1586, London, 8vo, to which the references are here made.

The papal claim to the right of deposing princes is based upon the alleged supremacy of the Bishop of Rome over all Christians; and it may be observed, by the way, that it is only *Christian* princes who theoretically possess the privilege of being capable of deposition by the Pope. This alleged power of the Pope is thus based ultimately on our Lord's promises to St. Peter. One is only too familiar in theological writings with amusing processes of (so-called) reasoning which figure as legitimate logical deductions; yet none of them perhaps are more deserving of ridicule than the argument from Scripture for the Pope's power to deprive princes.

Bilson's treatise has, however, another claim on the attention of students of the history of religious opinion in England. It is much occupied with an inquiry into the difficult practical problem as to when resistance to a legitimate ruler is morally lawful. Bilson's general conclusion, insisted on with much elaboration, is that subjects are morally bound to obey their hereditary princes, or, if conscience forbids this in any particular case, to suffer patiently for conscience' sake. In fact we have already in Bilson, in a fairly well-developed form, the doctrines of "the divine right of kings" and of "passive obedience," which came to figure so largely in later controversies. But exceptions

and qualifications of these doctrines were allowed by Bilson, which, whether rightly or wrongly understood, were afterwards made much of by the Puritan party in the days of the great rebellion.[1]

It was not till the next century that we find the patriarchal theory of the origin of government, with its doctrine of the absolute and divine authority of hereditary princes, grown to its full

[1] An extract from Bilson's work was printed off in 1641, and may be found in Lord Somers' *Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts*. It contains the following passage: "Neither will I rashly pronounce all that resist to be rebels: cases may fall out even in Christian kingdoms where the people may plead their rights against the prince and not be charged with rebellion. . . . If a prince should go about to subject his kingdom to a foreign realm, or change the form of the commonwealth from impery to tyranny, or neglect the laws established by common consent of prince and people to execute his own pleasure; in these and other cases which might be named, if the nobles and commons join together to defend their ancient and accustomed liberty, regiment and laws, they may not well be counted rebels." Perhaps not very consistently Bilson adds that even in such cases an hereditary prince, though he may be "reformed," must not be "deposed." Anthony Wood considers that "There is not any book that the Presbyterians have made more dangerous use of against their prince than that which his predecessor [Elizabeth] commanded to be written to justify her against the King of Spain." (*Athen. Oxon.*) In the eighteenth century Jeremy Collier, representing the sentiments of the nonjurors, considers that even this moderate statement "gives a dangerous latitude to subjects." (*Eccl. Hist.*, vii. 387.)

development, and receiving the general assent of Anglican divines.[1]

The Fourth Part of Bilson's work is devoted to showing that the English Reformation was "warranted by the word of God and the ancient faith of Christ's Church." He traverses much the same ground as Jewel, but presents his authorities and arguments in a briefer and more popular form. The pages dealing with the Roman doctrines of "the real presence" and "the sacrifice" in the mass are specially worthy of study. Bilson sees, more correctly than Jewel, that the language of the ancient canon of the mass, so far from supporting the modern Roman doctrine of the sacrifice, is in reality suggestive that that doctrine was unknown when the canon was composed. And he observes in a pregnant sentence that in the Eucharist Christ is crucified in the selfsame sort that He is sacrificed, "that is, both in mystery [*i. e.* symbol], neither in substance." The student of the Eucharistic controversy knows that a crucial and test question for

[1] See Canon II. in the volume known as *Bishop Overall's Convocation Book*, and more particularly Canon I. of the *Canons* of 1640. It is to be lamented that so many of our divines associated themselves with a political theory which at best is merely conjectural, and which alienated from the Church a large number of able and right-thinking men. To most English Churchmen of our own time the doctrines on this subject of Aquinas and Suarez will probably seem much more reasonable than those of our Jacobean and Caroline theologians.

determining the position of any writer on this subject is this—"Are the true Body and Blood of Christ received by the mouth?" Bilson's position may be seen from this reply—"The signs, which are called after consecration by the names of Christ's Body and Blood, do enter our mouths and pass our throats: the true Flesh and Blood of Christ do not." (p. 762.)

This work of Bilson is cast in the form of a dialogue between *Philander* (a Romanist) and *Theophilus* (an English Churchman). It is not infrequent to find in controversies presented by way of dialogue very weak arguments put into the mouth of the opponent, and men of straw set up to be easily knocked down. But in the present case *Philander's* authorities and arguments are drawn for the most part from the best Romish controversialists of the day, and generally in their very words.

It remains to be added that Bilson's style is clear, animated, and vigorous, and that, excepting Jewel, none of the sixteenth-century writers on the Roman controversy is more deserving than Bilson of careful study.

The great work of **Hooker** (to be noticed more fully in the next Lecture) was primarily designed to meet attacks upon the Church of England from another quarter. But it was impossible for him to deal with the assaults of the Puritan party without occasionally touching upon questions in the dispute with Rome. In

respect to several points of doctrine it was attempted by the Puritans to discredit the Anglican position by identifying the teaching of the English Church with that of Rome. Hooker therefore was compelled to reply to these charges. And here, as elsewhere, we look with ever-growing wonder and admiration at the calm, broad, self-possessed sanity of his judgment at a time when the prevailing animosity against Rome was keenly accentuated and extravagance of statement was only too common.

In our day it may be easy, in Hooker's day it was not easy, to make such an equitable and dignified statement as we find in the *Ecclesiastical Polity* (V. xxviii. 1):—"To say that in nothing they may be followed which are of the Church of Rome were violent and extreme. Some things they do in that they are men, in that they are wise and Christian men some things, some things in that they are men misled and blinded with error. As far as they follow reason and truth, we fear not to tread the self-same steps wherein they have gone, and to be their followers. Where Rome keepeth that which is ancienter and better, others whom we more affect leaving it for newer and changing it for worse; we had rather follow the perfections of them whom we like not, than in defects resemble them whom we love."

To the question, "Is the Roman communion

part of the visible Church of Christ?" Hooker answers in the affirmative, because Rome retains "those things which supernaturally appertain to the very essence of Christianity." "Touching those main parts of Christian truth wherein they constantly persist, we gladly acknowledge them to be of the family of Christ; and our hearty prayer unto Almighty God is, that being conjoined so far forth with them, they may at length (if it be His will) so yield to frame and *reform themselves* that no distraction remain in anything, but that we 'all may with one heart and one mouth glorify God the Father of our Lord and Saviour' whose Church we are." (*E. P.* III. i. 11). In the meanwhile "sundry her gross and grievous abominations" forbid our approach to Rome.

Hooker's view of the sacraments is too well known to require any lengthened exposition here. It may suffice to recall to mind a few characteristic sentences. "The substance of the Body of Christ hath no presence, neither *can* have, but only local." Christ's Body "being a part of that human nature which is presently joined unto Deity, wheresoever Deity is, it followeth that His bodily substance hath everywhere a presence of true conjunction with Deity." It has thus "a presence of *force and efficacy* through all generations." But, "if on all sides it is confessed that the grace of baptism is poured into the soul of man,—that by water

we receive it, though it be neither seated *in* the water, nor the water changed into it,—what should induce men to think that the grace of the Eucharist must needs be *in* the Eucharist before it can be in us that receive it?" "As Christ is called our life because through Him we obtain life, so the parts of this sacrament are His Body and Blood for that they are so *to us*, who receiving them receive that by them which they are termed." "The real presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament."[1]

As bearing on the sacrificial aspects of the Eucharist, it may be noted that Hooker declares that "sacrifice is now no part of the Church ministry." In reply to the question, "How should the name of priesthood be thereunto rightly applied?" he tells us that the name is applied only by way of analogy, "in regard of that which the Gospel hath *proportionable* to ancient sacrifices, namely the Communion of the blessed Body and Blood of Christ, although it have properly now no sacrifice. . . . In truth the word *Presbyter* doth seem more fit, and in propriety of speech more agrecable than *Priest* with the drift of the whole Gospel of Jesus Christ. . . . The Holy Ghost, throughout the body of the New Testament, making so much mention of them, doth not anywhere call them

[1] See *E. P.* V. lv. and lxvii.

Priests." But as to the *name* Hooker is indifferent. "Let them use what dialect they will; whether we call it a Priesthood, a Presbytership, or a Ministry, it skilleth not." [1]

Lastly, we may observe that Hooker discusses at length the Roman doctrine of sacramental absolution, and concludes, in direct opposition to it, that the absolution pronounced by the priest is as regards *sin* solely declaratory. It does not take away sin, but only pronounces that God has taken it away. As regards *ecclesiastical censures*, however, it "looseth the chains wherewith we were tied." [2]

However little we may agree with the views here expressed in a history of theological opinion, the great reputation attached to Hooker's name may be thought sufficient to justify these references to his judgments on these points.

In the later part of the reign of Elizabeth a minor controversy of much interest occupied much attention among scholars. It is with regret that it is found necessary to deal with it here in mere outline. The indisposition of

[1] See *E. P.* V. lxxviii. Waterland (*Works*, V. p. 140, edit. 1843) conjectures that the meaning of Hooker is that the Gospel has now no sacrifice, understood in the sense of the Council of Trent. "But," he adds, "I commend not the use of such *new language*, be the meaning never so right; the Fathers never used it."

[2] See *E. P.* VI. vi.

Romanists to give the people the Holy Scriptures in the mother tongue was practically overcome by the necessities of circumstance. The Bible in English was already wide-spread throughout the country. To counteract the evil it was supposed to do, it was resolved by the Seminarist leaders to put out a version of their own, made, however, not from the originals but from "the authentical Latin" of the *Vulgate*. This version was accompanied, as the title sets forth, by "annotations and other necessary helps for the better understanding of the text." The New Testament, printed at Rheims, appeared in 1582. Both the version itself and the notes (many of them of a highly controversial character) are subjects of frequent comment and discussion in the writings of Anglican divines of the period. In the same year in which the Rhemish Testament saw the light, Gregory Martin, formerly a Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, a man of considerable attainments in Greek and Hebrew, who had joined the Roman Church and was now a lecturer in the Seminary abroad, published an attack on the accuracy of the earlier English authorized translations. This, besides serving other purposes, was meant to further the interests of the new Romish version.

The Anglican theologians were not slow in replying. In the following year (1583) Dr. **William Fulke** († 1589), Master of Pembroke

Hall, Cambridge, issued his *Defence of the Translations of the Holy Scriptures into the English tongue.* Martin had contended that the English heretics had falsely translated the Scriptures "of purpose." He accused them of deliberate bad faith, and in support of the charge alleged a large number of instances. Fulke answered in detail; and some years later (1589) he carried the war into the enemy's camp by attacking the Rhemish version both in its text and its controversial notes. Setting aside the imputation of *mala fides*, there can be no question that Martin pointed out several errors, many of which were afterwards corrected in the "Authorised Version" of 1611.[1] Much use was in the next century made of Martin's book by Thomas Ward, who in the reign of James II. produced his *Errata of the Protestant Bible*, a work which has been frequently reprinted.[2] Historical students of the English versions of the Scriptures will find much that is valuable and entertaining in these controversies; but they now possess for us only a literary interest. It may be left to all candid students to judge whether the desire

[1] Thomas Cartwright, the "T. C." of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, also wrote at this time in reply to Martin; but his work was not published till 1618.

[2] Ward is also known to the curious by his scurrilous verses on the English Reformation, written in the style of Hudibras.

of the Anglican communion in our own day is not to offer to the English reader in his mother tongue the full and true meaning of the original text of the Scriptures, as presented by the best lights of modern scholarship.

LECTURE II

The Anglican and Puritan positions—The *Apparel* controversy—Attack on the constitution of the Church—The two *Admonitions to Parliament*—Whitgift and Cartwright—The *Mar-prelate* Tracts—Bilson's *Perpetual Government of the Church*—Hooker—Calvinism in the Church of England—Whitaker and Baron—The decay of Calvinism—Broughton and Bilson on the *Descent into Hell*—Davenant.

THE Church of England, so far as regards its constitution, organization, and external framework, came out of the great struggle of the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. substantially unchanged, save only in one particular,—the repudiation of the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome. The historical continuity of the Church was untouched and inviolate. Its form of government, its maintenance of the historical episcopate, its conciliar assemblies were maintained. It presented indeed a unique figure among the reformed churches of Europe.

When England began to adjust herself after the struggle there immediately were manifested

among English churchmen two well-marked and divergent tendencies; and as time went on the distinction and divergence became more noticeable. These tendencies we may, for convenience, designate the *Anglican* and the *Puritan* tendencies. The first of these showed itself in a general disposition *conservative* of existing order, doctrine, and usage, except where they manifestly appeared to be abuses of the apostolic teaching and primitive practice. The second showed itself in a desire for an entire reconstruction from the very foundation of the Church's faith, order, and discipline. The typical Puritan took up the Bible as if, like the image that fell down from Jupiter, it had suddenly dropped from the sky; and as if he were called upon, then and there, to construct from it a new religion and a new scheme of life. He set himself, as if he were the firstborn on the earth and none had lived before him, to discover in its pages a body of doctrine, a system of Church government, a rule of divine worship, a rule of conduct. The typical Anglican believed that Christ had founded a living Church, guided by His Spirit, and that that Church, however much enfeebled by error and corruption, had lived through the ages. The garden enclosed, which was committed to his care, had indeed been overgrown by noxious weeds that choked the good seeds of God's planting. But the necessary weeding he sought to accomplish with care and

discrimination.[1] The Puritan uprooted his whole inheritance, passed the ploughshare through it, and sought to begin afresh. It seemed a plan at once simple and thorough. A hundred difficulties on the other hand beset the Anglican reformers; and it may be acknowledged that the work was accomplished with results not wholly satisfactory. Who will venture to say that some wholesome plants that in after-time might have borne good fruit were not over-hastily dragged up; and who will venture to say that at the time no obscure evil weeds escaped notice, which have since gone to seed and spread? But, estimated as a whole, the results of the *conservative,* as opposed to the *revolutionary* methods of ecclesiastical reform have justified themselves. The growth of the Anglican Communion; its inherent and strong vitality, and its remarkable power of adaptation to a varied habitat and varied surroundings; its constant touch with what is practical; its large measure of intellectual freedom; its moderation and broad sanity of judgment; its manifold appeals to all sorts and conditions of men, gentle and simple, rich and poor, learned and unlearned, cultured and homely; these are facts which

[1] "I make no doubt," wrote Bramhall (*Works*, i. 113, A. C. L.), "that the Church of England before the Reformation and the Church of England after the Reformation are as much the same Church, as a garden before it is weeded and after it is weeded is the same garden."

cannot be set aside, and which now justify the actual solution of the problem so perplexing even to wise men in the middle of the sixteenth century.

In order of time it was on a matter in itself of comparative unimportance—the Church's regulations as to clerical apparel—that there first appeared the essential difference between the two parties. But trivial as was the occasion of the controversy, it involved a grave question of principle. Did a national Church possess the right to determine rites, ceremonies, costume, and the externals of divine worship—things acknowledged to be in themselves indifferent? The wisdom of enforcing the use of the corner-cap, the surplice, or the sign of the cross in baptism does not here concern us. But the individual member of the Church who rejects these because they are not enjoined in Holy Scripture has wholly failed to grasp the nature of the Church of Christ as a divinely appointed society.

It need hardly be said that many of the abler men among the anti-vesturists did not attempt to justify their action on grounds so futile. They based their refusal to comply with the ordinances promulgated by authority on the moral obligation that attaches to what is expedient. They were so strongly convinced of the evil that would grow out of the retention of apparel associated in the popular mind with

Romish superstition that they declined to obey. These private persons, some of them good and able men, set their judgment against that of those in authority. They were examples of a spirit that is impatient of the restraint of authority and would fain be a law unto itself. Illustrations of a similar temper in a quarter commonly placed at the very opposite pole to Puritanism have not been unknown among the English clergy in our own day.[1]

The controversy as to clerical apparel was followed by a daring attack upon the episcopal constitution of the Church. Many of the Marian exiles had been fascinated by the simplicity and supposed scripturalness of the Genevan model of Church government. That the bishops, though often against their inclinations, were the instruments for enforcing the laws as to ritual conformity, helped to accentuate the growing dislike to the hierarchy. In 1572 there issued from the press the first important manifesto of the Puritan party. It was the outcome of private conferences among the leaders, held in London, where nonconformity was rife; and its drift is expressed in its full title, which runs as follows:—

[1] The sagacious Archbishop Parker, writing to the Lord Treasurer, probably represents the view of the wiser of the Anglicans: "Does your Lordship think that I care either for cap, tippet, surplice, or wafer-bread, or any such? But for the laws so established I esteem them." Strype's *Parker*, iii. 332.

An admonition to the Parliament. A view of popish abuses yet remaining in the English Church, for the which godly ministers have refused to subscribe. The immediate cause of its publication was the Act, passed in the Parliament of the preceding year, enforcing subscription to the Articles of Religion. The writers declared that hitherto they had borne with that in the Book of Common Prayer which they could not amend, and had used it "so far forth as they might"; but now they were called upon to declare that it was "not against the word of God in any point." This they could not do, for they believed that "some and many of the contents therein be such as are against the word of God." It was a book, they said, "culled and picked out of the popish dunghill, the portuise and mass-book full of all abominations." The "pontifical," or ordinal, they treat in a similar style. "As safely may we, by the warrant of God's word, subscribe to allow the dominion of the Pope universally to rule over the word of God, as of an archbishop over a whole province, or of a lord bishop over a diocese which containeth many shires and parishes." The government of the English hierarchy is briefly described as "anti-christian and devilish, and contrary to the Scriptures." They make comparatively light of the question of apparel (though they maintain that "there is neither order, nor comeliness, nor obedience in using it"), and declare that the

"great matters" are concerning "the regiment and government of the Church according to the word." This was shortly after followed up by "*A Second Admonition*," in which the bishops are described as "no other than a remnant of Antichrist's brood."[1] The first *Admonition* rapidly passed through four editions. **John Whitgift** (1530—1604), then Dean of Lincoln, who had held various high offices in the colleges and in the University of Cambridge,[2] was called on to reply to it; and there soon (1572) appeared *An answer to a certain libel, intitled an Admonition to the Parliament.*

Thomas Cartwright (? 1535—1603) was by far the ablest exponent of the Puritan principles. He had been a Fellow of St. John's, and Lady Margaret Professor, at Cambridge. He was a man of learning as well as of zeal; and his admirable English style was well fitted to add to the favour with which his writings were received. He issued a *Reply* (1573) to Whitgift, who rejoined in a *Defence of the Answer* (1574). The controversy brought out distinctly the absolute irreconcilableness of Puritanism with Anglican principles.

The overshadowing greatness of Hooker, deal-

[1] The *Second Admonition* is generally regarded as Cartwright's work.

[2] Master of Pembroke, Master of Trinity, Lady Margaret Professor, Regius Professor of Divinity, Vice-Chancellor.

ing with the same subject, has in later times obscured the considerable merits of Whitgift. He deals with his opponent in the old and elaborate method of taking up paragraph by paragraph. In the discussion of the detailed objections to the Book of Common Prayer he is often happy, and is particularly effective when he refutes Cartwright out of the writings of Calvin, Zwingle, Beza, Bucer, and Peter Martyr. But what seems now of most interest to observe is that in the principles which guide his comment Whitgift is quite at one with Hooker. He asserts "the authority of the Church in things indifferent," and, like Hooker, he is content, as regards Episcopacy, to deny that Scripture "doth set down any certain form and kind of government of the Church to be perpetual for all times and places without alteration."[1] "In matter of order, ceremonies, and government it is sufficient if they be not repugnant to Scripture."[2] Indeed, we know that Hooker availed himself of the judgment of Whitgift before the publication of his great work.[3] And he acknowledges that the errors with which he dealt had "received their first wound" from the hand of Whitgift.[4] But between these two vindications of Anglicanism there is the difference that separ-

[1] *Works* (P. S.), i. 191.
[2] *Ibid.* 239.
[3] See Keble's Preface to Hooker's *Works*.
[4] *E. P.*, dedication of Book V.

ates a work of industry and good sense, written for a special occasion, from an outcome of genius and philosophic insight, wide in its reach and general in its application. As Archbishop of Canterbury, Whitgift came afterwards to play an important part in the Church's history; but as a contributor to the theological literature of England he cannot be assigned a high place.

The *Martin Mar-prelate* tracts are curiosities in an obscure by-path of literature; but their low and scurrilous buffoonery makes no claim upon one here. The ablest of the Puritan leaders avowed, no doubt with perfect truth, their "mislike and sorrow" at such vile productions. But, nevertheless, there can be no question that among the unthinking crowd, which in every age heartily enjoys abusive assaults upon the constituted authorities, these ribald libels fostered prejudices and inflamed passions that were not easily allayed. Serious writers could not deal effectively with such productions;[1] but a wit superior in caustic raillery to any of the *Mar-prelate* scribblers appeared in the person of Thomas Nash, who replied in like kind. At length the scandal of the embittered strife grew to such a height that it was found advisable to close the controversy by an order of the autho-

[1] The attempt was made by T. C. (Thomas Cooper, Bishop of Winchester) in his *Admonition to the People of England* (1589), which may be found in Mr. Arber's *Reprints*.

rities for the seizure and suppression of the pamphlets on both sides.[1]

Thomas Bilson has already come under our notice in connection with the Roman controversy.[2] The controversy with Puritanism drew from him a contribution to our theological literature of the highest value, the work entitled *The perpetual government of Christ's Church* (1593).[3] In this treatise the claims to scriptural and patristic authority for the institution of "ruling," as distinguished from "teaching," elders (a central and essential element of the "Genevan platform") are completely pulverized. The whole figment of the Presbyterian theory of Church government is mercilessly exposed, and the apostolic origin of episcopacy in the sense of a permanent pre-eminence of a single ruler over a body of presbyters is established on historical grounds. This work is well fitted to raise in the mind of the careful student not only a conviction of the apostolic origin of episcopacy as a historical fact, but also a strong presump-

[1] Much valuable bibliographical information will be found in Mr. Arber's *Introductory sketch to the Martin Mar-prelate Controversy*. See also the earlier work of Mr. Maskell, *History of the Martin Mar-prelate Controversy*, 1843.

[2] See pp. 32—36.

[3] It appeared again in 1610, and a Latin translation was published in 1611. The latter contained some additions, which have been reproduced by Rev. Robert Eden in his edition of 1842, Oxford.

tion against the lawfulness of the competing system. The analogies drawn from "the fatherly superiority" of the patriarchal system, and the gradations of the ministry in the Mosaic law are dwelt upon; but, of course, the main stress of Bilson's argument proceeds on the grounds of the New Testament history and the unanimous testimony of the ancient Church. Mr. Keble[1] certainly does Bilson's treatise no more than justice, when he describes it as "full of good learning and sound argument, regularly arranged and clearly expressed." It is indeed on the subject discussed a recognized authority, not less valuable to-day than when it was penned.[2]

The commanding eminence of **Hooker** (1554—1600), and his place as an acknowledged classic of the first rank in English theology, have made an acquaintance with his works sufficiently wide-spread to spare us the task of attempting here a detailed account of his writings. He is known beyond the circle of students of theology. His English style has given him a high place in general literature. The stately dignity of its movement, the depth and richness of its musical diapason, its variety and flexibility, its rhythmical grace, and its occasional flights of lofty eloquence have secured him a place of

[1] Hooker's *Works*: Preface, p. lxix.

[2] Eden's excellent edition has one grave defect—it lacks an index.

permanent honour among the greatest masters of the English tongue.[1] And style, let us remember, is the outcome of the man. It is no artificial bedizenment of thought. It is thought making for itself a body fitted to its needs. It is a vital and intimate union of the immaterial and the material. And apart from the apt conveyance of thought and emotion, it is precious because it reveals to us the thinker himself. Who can rise from the study of Hooker without a sense of a greatness that lies beyond and above such qualities as acuteness of perception, or intellectual force, or imaginative fertility, or learning, or argumentative power? All these are there; but there is something more. We are conscious of a moral majesty that humbles us. We feel the quickened beat of the writer's heart as he treats of the revelation of the wisdom and goodness of the Eternal Giver of life and law. We are sensible of the wide, capacious, all-encircling atmosphere of awe and wonder in which the great thinker lives and moves; and our admiration passes into reverence.

The strange levity which mars by its incongruity some of the most solemn utterances of his great contemporary, Lancelot Andrewes, is unknown to the writings of Hooker. That he

[1] See a discriminating judgment on Hooker's style in Dean Church's introduction to *Book I. of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, edited for the Clarendon Press.

was not without a sense of humour is plain enough. To be without it is a serious defect in any man. He knows, too, and employs, as occasion demands, the weapon of a lofty irony; but its use is comparatively rare, and never untimely. Nothing jars us in his sarcasm. Rarely, if ever, does Hooker offend against the spirit of his own golden sentence—"There will come a time when three words uttered with charity and meekness shall receive a far more blessed reward than three thousand volumes written with disdainful sharpness of wit." This is the more remarkable in an age when in controversy not merely the courtesies, but even the common decencies of life were too often forgotten.

The *Ecclesiastical Polity* has been described as "a monument of real learning in profane as well as theological antiquity."[1] And, we may add, it is learning which, in an age when there were many temptations to display, is without the slightest taint of pedantry. But abounding, as it is, in learning, it is not its learning that gives the *Ecclesiastical Polity* its pre-eminent distinction. It is to his masterly grasp of fundamental principles that Hooker owes his abiding influence. From the controversy forced upon him by Walter Travers, his able colleague and rival in the pulpit of the Temple Church, Hooker retired to investigate, and to sound to their lowest depths the great principles involved.

[1] Hallam's *Literature of Europe*, ii. 42 (sixth edition).

The dispute in which he was engaged led him straight to the inquiry into the true basis of law, natural and supernatural, human and divine, its just extent and limitations, its relevancy in various cases, its sanctions. It is probable that the duties required by his office in London were felt to interfere with the quiet demanded for patient research. At any rate, he exchanged the Mastership of the Temple for the obscure country benefice of Boscombe, near Salisbury; and there after some four years he completed the first four of the eight Books which he had planned to form his great work. It would seem that not less than some six years altogether were devoted to the preparation of this first instalment (1593 or 1594) of the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. After some four more years the Fifth Book appeared (1597). By the time of his death, at the comparatively early age of forty-seven, the three remaining Books were probably completed.[1]

In Hooker we have a man of speculative and philosophic genius dealing with problems of thought that possess perennial interest for the human mind. The elaborately detailed defence of the constitution and liturgical forms of the English Church is based upon broad foundations

[1] The literary questions as to the integrity of the three last Books are discussed in Keble's Preface. It is all but certain that the Sixth Book was seriously tampered with by ecclesiastical opponents into whose hands the manuscript had fallen.

laid with singular care and thoroughness. Notably the First Book, but also to a large extent the Second and the Third, are concerned with the fundamental principles that lie at the bases of all polities, whether civil or ecclesiastical. To those who have freshly emerged from the controversies of preceding writers the discussion of these elemental truths may seem remote from the business in hand. The controversialist who is eager to score points, and loves the rapid give and take of hand-to-hand encounter, will be very impatient of the deliberate movement by which Hooker secures his strategic position. But Hooker rightly divined that the establishment of first principles was essential to his purpose; and he laboured at his task with a largeness of knowledge and comprehensiveness of judgment that fill one with astonishment and admiration.

In the subsequent treatment of details we find, with rare exceptions, the same breadth of mind, conjoined with a candour and sense of equity, which makes Hooker a model to all controversialists. He would have been more than human if he were not now and then betrayed into what seems to us the faults of the partisan in attempting to defend real deficiencies and errors in then existing ordinances of the Church.[1]

[1] See S. T. Coleridge, *Notes on English Divines*, i. 21; and Bishop Barry's remarks in *Masters in English Theology*, p. 19.

A singular and marked characteristic of Hooker is his ready openness to truth from whatever quarter it might present itself. All through his writings we recognize the underlying conviction that God reveals Himself in many ways, and that it is only after weighing the whole mass of varied testimony we may take upon us to pronounce judgment. The natural intelligence and reason of man has its say, and conscience, and Holy Scripture, and human authority, whether expressing itself in the dicta of Greek philosophers, or of Fathers of the Church, or of mediæval Schoolmen. He is ready to hear these many voices, to test, to judge every contribution of evidence. And he would give to every element its due weight and value. Human authority he respects, but he is not servile in his submission to its utterances. *What* a man says is of more interest to him than *who* says it. He never allows his judgment to be bullied by great names. After all has been said, he declares, "wise men are men, and the truth is truth." He is in the good sense of the phrase "a rational theologian." Human reason duly informed is the court of ultimate appeal. It is no infallible judge. It is oftentimes a judge perplexed and doubtful. But, after all, it is the best we can resort to.

It is from this steady resolve to assume nothing, to listen patiently to evidence of every kind and from every quarter, to test it, to weigh

it and estimate its value, and, only after all this has been done, to sum it up and pronounce his decision, that the epithet "judicious," in its old English meaning of "judicial," is so aptly applied to Richard Hooker.

The Puritan thesis that Holy Scripture is the sole guide for man in the religious sphere was from the first an impracticable position; and it has long been tacitly abandoned. The ritual of Protestant nonconformists will not stand the test; at no time could it stand it; and practices formerly denounced as "unscriptural" are now being adopted with rapidity in every direction around us.

On another important question that occupied Hooker's attention, the question of Church government, there has also been a vast change of opinion and sentiment. As to the lay or ruling eldership of the Genevan "platform," there is to-day probably no competent scholar anywhere who will venture to assert that it is of apostolic origin, or *jure divino*, in the sense of being of direct divine institution. In truth nothing in history is more certain than that the "ruling eldership" is a mere figment devised for the first time in the sixteenth century. As Hooker himself truly observed, "a very strange thing sure it were that such a discipline as ye speak of should be taught by Christ and His apostles in the word of God, and no Church

ever have found it out, nor received it till this present time." While on the other hand recent investigations into early Church history, conducted in a severely scientific spirit, have all gone directly to establish the truth of what we now know to be the strictly accurate historical statement of our Ordinal, "that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."

For the purpose he had in hand Hooker was content at first to maintain that in the matter of Church polity, as in the matter of ceremonial and ritual, the living Church possessed the right of determining its form. He was arguing against the *jure divino* claim of Presbyterianism; and it sufficiently served his end to maintain that even if the Presbyterian "platform" were of apostolic origin, it was not on that account necessarily immutable, or best suited to the Church in all places and at all times. And this position of Hooker's is the more remarkable when we find him declaring—"If we did seek to maintain that which most advantageth our own cause, the very best way for us, and the strongest against them [Presbyterians], were to hold even as they do, that in Scripture there must needs be found some particular form of Church polity, which God hath instituted, and which for that very cause belongeth to all Churches and to all times." "But," he adds,

"with such partial eye to respect ourselves, and by cunning to make those things seem the truest which are the fittest to serve our purpose, is a thing which we neither like nor mean to follow." (*E. P.* III. x. 8.) But, as has been pointed out,[1] Hooker's further investigations led him to speak more plainly, though in no way departing from his view of the *theoretical mutability* of the form of the Church's government. "Let us not fear to be herein bold and peremptory, that if anything in the Church's government, surely the first institution of bishops was from heaven, was even of God, the Holy Ghost was the author of it." (*E. P.* VII. v. 10.)

Readers of Hooker are often taken with surprise and delight at the pregnant utterances, or the penetrating and illuminative declarations that are met with unexpectedly from time to time in the course of the main argument. Thus some will recall the wonderful passage on the relation of the divine prescience to the freedom of the human will. In the First Book we again and again meet anticipations of the ethics of Butler. No earlier English writer has so vividly exhibited sin as *a violation of nature*, or dwelt more effectively on the relation of conscience to human conduct. Theologians have constantly viewed with admiration those chapters of the Fifth Book which treat with singular dignity,

[1] See Bishop Barry in *Masters of English Theology*, p. 50.

and with such lucidity of thought as was possible on such a subject, the great central mystery of Christianity, the union of the divine and human natures in the Person of Christ. Again, Hooker's teaching of the value and acceptableness of prayer considered as "a presentation of mere desires" will come as a help to some in our own day perplexed by the relation of prayer to the physical laws of nature. (*E. P.* V. xlviii.) And nowhere can be discovered a more beautiful and touching expression of the profoundest humility, united with sure confidence in God, than is to be found in the Sermon, *Of the certainty and perpetuity of faith in the elect.* It is seldom that argumentative treatises, where effect must be judged by its whole presentment of truth, abound so richly in brilliant gems of thought easily detachable.

Our brief and very imperfect estimate of Hooker may be fitly brought to a close in the eloquent words of a critic who was not himself a member of the Anglican communion. "If," says the late Principal Tulloch, "the Church of England had never produced any other writer of the same stamp, it might yet have boasted in Hooker one of the noblest and most rational intellects which ever enriched Christian literature, or adorned a great cause. In combination of speculative, literary, imaginative, and spiritual qualities the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* stands as a polemical treatise unrivalled. . . . Nowhere

in the literature of philosophy has ethical and political speculation essayed a profounder and more comprehensive task, or sought to take a broader sweep; and never has the harmony of the moral universe, and the interdependence and unity of man's spiritual and civil life, in their multiplied relations, been more finely conceived or more impressively expounded."[1]

The influence of Calvin and the Swiss school was powerful in England not only in affecting speculation on the constitution of the Church but also, and even more noticeably in all but completely dominating theological belief on the character of God's election, and predestination, and the other allied subjects. By the middle of the seventeenth century the body of doctrines commonly known as "Calvinism" came to be associated almost exclusively with Presbyterian and other sectaries. But in the earlier period, more particularly towards the close of Elizabeth's reign, Calvinism was all but universal among the clergy of the Church of England. "It may be confidently affirmed," writes one of the most accurate of historical inquirers, "that during an interval of nearly thirty years the more *extreme* opinions of the school of Calvin, not excluding his theory of irrespective reprobation, were predominant in almost every town

[1] See the whole passage in *Rational Theology in England in the Seventeenth Century* (2nd edit.), i. 52, *sq.*

and parish."[1] Able men at the seats of learning gave their support to the high Calvinian views. Most notable among these was **William Whitaker** (1547—1595), who for a time held the office of Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. His reputation as a writer in the controversy with Rome had spread far beyond the bounds of England. Cardinal Bellarmine spoke of him as "the most learned heretic he had ever read," and thought fit to place his portrait in his library. Stapleton, Sanders, Campian, and the Seminarists knew him as a most formidable opponent.[2] The esteem in which his high character was held added to the influence he had acquired by his learning. Bishop Hall, of Norwich, writes with affectionate warmth of his memory—"What clearness of judgment, what sweetness of style, what gravity of person was in that man! Who ever saw him without reverence, or heard him without wonder?"[3]

It is not to be wondered at that under the influence of this eminent man Calvinism was

[1] Archdeacon Hardwick, in his *History of the Articles* (2nd edit.), p. 167.

[2] His work, *Ad rationes decem Edmundi Campiani . . . Responsio* (1581), quickly ran through three editions, and appeared in an English version in 1606. Another important work of his is, *Disputatio de Sacra Scriptura* (directed chiefly against Bellarmine), 1588. See Parker Society's edition of Whitaker's *Disputation.*

[3] One of the most charming of Hall's poems is his "Elegy on Dr. Whitaker." See *Works*, xii. 323.

rife in Cambridge. But it met a check at the hand of another member of the Cambridge faculty of theology, **Peter Baron** (Baro), the Margaret Professor. And it is interesting to observe that if France, through Calvin, had so largely affected English theology, it was France, in the person of Baron, which was here among the first to bring about the discredit of the Calvinistic system. And "exactly as a generation of students, moulded by his teaching, had been gradually replacing the admirers of Calvin and Bullinger, the *Institutio*, the *Decades*, and a host of similar text-books were exchanged for volumes of the Fathers and occasionally of the Schoolmen."[1] The academic disputes and the troubles which followed do not come within our scope. But it may be noticed that it was, without doubt, largely due to the commanding influence of Whitaker that the Lambeth Articles were framed, and accepted by Archbishop Whitgift and several of his episcopal brethren. Indeed some of the most vigorous opponents of the nonconformists in ritual were among the warmest supporters of the extremes of Calvinistic doctrine.

These discredited Articles, we may observe in passing, now serve the useful purpose of showing us that our XXXIX. Articles, which have been often, because of their Augustinian colouring, spoken of as teaching Calvinistic doctrine, were regarded as altogether unsatis-

[1] Hardwick, p. 169.

factory and insufficient by those who had really adopted Calvin's opinions.

The new school of thought, represented by Overall and Andrewes at Cambridge, gradually extended its influence. And it is one of the curious phenomena in the history of doctrine that without any authoritative pronouncement on the subject, or the production of any really great controversial treatise, there was in course of time a general shifting of opinion, till Calvinism ceased to be a considerable power within the bounds of the Church of England, and so continued till, in a very much modified form, it was partially and temporarily resuscitated by the "Evangelical movement" in more recent times. In the later years of Elizabeth the battlemented stronghold of Calvinism towered aloft and dominated the Church. It was supported by those in highest station. It seemed to stand secure. The fire of no heavy theological artillery was directed against it. It was assaulted by no great leader of thought, and its position seemed to call for no active defence. Yet gradually, one knows not how, its strength was sapped; and in time it came to be like a great frowning fortress silently abandoned. Its compacted stones were loosened, as it were, by wind and weather, and before fifty years it had become, as a power in the theological thought of the Church of England, no better than a crumbling ruin.

In the reign of James, at the very time when the King's deputation of English divines to the Synod of Dort (1618) might have seemed to give countenance to the Calvinists, there were plain indications of the approaching change. The English deputies firmly asserted "the universality of Christ's redemption," differing here (as also in the "ministerial parity" theory) from the majority of the Synod. The succeeding "Quinquarticular controversy" in England was no more than a series of sharp skirmishes in no way decisive, and leaving behind it little or nothing of permanent value as the literary result.

Though we may be tempted now to smile at the restriction, there seems to have been much sagacity in the King's policy as manifested in his "Directions concerning preachers" (1622), in which it was enjoined "that no preacher . . . under the degree of a bishop, or dean at the least, do henceforth presume to preach in any popular auditory the deep points of predestination, election, reprobation, or the universality, efficacy, resistibility or irresistibility of God's grace." A relic of a later stage of the contention we still possess in "His Majesty's Declaration" (1628) prefixed to the XXXIX. Articles. When young men are protected from publicly committing themselves to some particular side in controversy they have time to think and examine; and this paternal tyranny of James and his son was in actual fact not unwholesome.

But though we must here be content to pass over the unimportant literature bearing on "the Five Points," it is worthy of record that at the close of the sixteenth century one particular Calvinistic thesis, which had figured largely not only in learned treatises, but in the current popular teaching, was successfully assailed and destroyed. This was the notion that our Lord had in His passion in the Garden and on Calvary suffered "the death of the soul," including all the agonies of rejection and malediction felt by damned souls in hell, and that this was the sense to be attached to the article of the Creed, "He descended into Hell." Hugh Broughton, who had been a Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, and enjoyed a great reputation as a learned Hebraist and Rabbinical scholar, was among the earliest to perceive the baseless character of Calvin's assertion. In 1597 Bishop Bilson, whose name has already come before us in other connections,[1] dealt with the question in two sermons preached at Paul's Cross. These caused much discussion, and were publicly replied to by another preacher before a similar auditory at the same place. Whereupon Bilson set himself to a thorough investigation of the matters in dispute. While engaged on his labours, Broughton's *Explication of the Article concerning the descent into Hades* (1599) appeared; and it was not till five years later (1604) that

[1] See pp. 32-7; 53-4.

Bilson published his great folio, *The survey of Christ's sufferings for man's redemption; and of His descent to Hades or Hell for our deliverance.* The exegesis both of Scripture and patristic authorities seem to me in many cases incorrect, and still more frequently highly questionable. But nevertheless his main thesis in opposition to Calvin is sufficiently established, and the work remains a vast magazine of erudition on the mysterious questions connected with the state of the soul after its departure from this life.

The Calvinistic tradition on the predestinarian controversy is represented in the seventeenth century by the solid learning of **John Davenant** (1576—1641), Lady Margaret Professor, President of Queen's College, Cambridge, and afterwards Bishop of Salisbury. His *Expositio Epistolæ D. Pauli ad Colossenses* (1627) went through several editions; and his *Disputatio de Justitia habituali et actuali* (1631) is claimed by Bishop Bull, in support of his own teaching on the relation of good works to justification, as lucidly setting forth the sound and orthodox doctrine of the Church of England.[1]

[1] *Harmonia Apostolica*, Dissert. Posterior, xviii. 10.

LECTURE III

The seventeenth century, the "Golden Age" of Anglican Theology—Rainoldes, President of Corpus—Field, Dean of Gloucester—Bishop Andrewes—Marcantonio De Dominis and Crakanthorp—Dean Jackson—Ussher, the "giant among giants."

NO period of like extent in our Church's history is more rich in writers of high distinction than the years covered by the monarchy of the house of Stuart. The extraordinary outburst of intellectual power, which so brilliantly illuminates the general literature of England during the closing years of Elizabeth's reign and the early years of that of James I., extended to the field of theology. And in that department of thought there was no substantial diminution in the force and volume of the intellectual movement till towards the end of the century.

During this period there are to be reckoned not only writers of the first rank, each one a classic in English theology, like Field, Andrewes, Ussher, Sanderson, Taylor, Pearson, Barrow, and Bull, but a crowd of lesser men, who yet stand

out distinctly above the level of mediocrity. To one introduced for the first time into this goodly company, the throng is embarrassing. He is perplexed and bewildered by the number of striking figures that surround him.

At the beginning of the period no divine of the Church had a higher repute for learning than **Dr. John Rainoldes** (1549—1607),[1] President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.[2] Fuller, the Church historian, calls attention to the fact that Jewel, Hooker, and Rainoldes were all Devonshire men, and were all three educated at Corpus. "No one county in England," he observes in his quaint manner, "bare three such men, contemporary at large, in what college soever they were bred; no college in England bred such three men, in what county soever they were born." Yet the name of Rainoldes will probably recall to the memories even of those possessing some general acquaintance with our Church's history, nothing more than the fact that he was the chief spokesman of the Puritans at the Hampton Court conference, and perhaps the curious story of how he and his brother in early life, engaging in dispute on the claims of Popery and of Protestantism, each con-

[1] The name is variously spelled Rainoldes, Rainolds, Raynolds, and Reynolds. I have followed his own orthography.

[2] He had been Dean of Lincoln, and declined a bishopric, preferring the opportunities for study afforded at the University.

verted the other. John, the advocate of Rome, became a staunch Protestant; while William, the Protestant champion, appears as one of the most active and able controversialists at the Romish college at Rheims.[1] But John Rainoldes deserves to be better known.

Rainoldes, who had the distinction of being Hooker's tutor, was in his own day regarded with profound respect for his colossal erudition. His powers of memory, which rendered his vast learning promptly serviceable, are spoken of as a marvel; and to him have been applied, with better reason than to some others on whom similar eulogistic language has been bestowed, the phrases "a living library" and "the third university of England." His fame extended "beyond seas." Joseph Scaliger, himself perhaps the most learned man of his generation, laments the death of Rainoldes as a grievous loss not only to England, but to all Christian Churches. In our own time Hallam counts him as probably not at all inferior to Jewel.

The sympathies of Rainoldes were with the moderate Puritans. On vestiary questions, with his usual good sense, he entirely conformed himself to the Church's rule. The surplice and square-cap, which caused so much heart-burning to others, were no stumbling-block to him. On

[1] William Rainoldes had been a Fellow of New College, Oxford; and after his secession became a Professor of Divinity at Rheims.

his death-bed he earnestly desired absolution according to the form of the Church of England, and gratefully kissed the hand of the priest from whom he received it.

The personal influence of Rainoldes is said to have powerfully affected King James in promoting the design for the revision of the translation of the Holy Scriptures, which resulted in our Authorised Version; and he himself was one of "the Oxford company" to whom the Prophets of the Old Testament were assigned.

Rainoldes died in 1607; and it was not till 1611 that his greatest work saw the light. This is entitled *Censura Librorum Apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti*.[1] This treatise consists of Latin prelections delivered at Oxford, commencing in Michaelmas term, 1585, and running on for some seven years. The prelections had originally been two hundred and fifty in number, and are published (with the loss of about half-a-dozen) from very full notes taken by some of his hearers. They are mainly directed against Cardinal Bellarmine's attempt to vindicate the canonicity of the Apocryphal books of the Old Testament; but questions arising incidentally are frequently followed out with much thoroughness and fulness of detail.

In the Roman communion up to the time of the Council of Trent, the question as to the

[1] Oppenheim, 2 tom. 4to.

books that formed the Canon of Scripture was not closed. Not only did the critical acumen of Erasmus express itself with a modest hesitancy as to the reception of the Apocryphal books, but magnates of the Church, such as Cardinal Caietan, boldly rejected the books that had been added to the Hebrew Canon. At Trent this difficult question was discussed by some thirty divines at four meetings; and at the end, by a majority, it was resolved to fix the Canon by including the Apocryphal books, and to make the acceptance of the new list an article of faith under pain of anathema. This decision was ratified by fifty-three prelates, among whom, says Bishop Westcott, there was "not one scholar distinguished for historical learning, not one who was fitted by special study for the examination of a subject in which the truth could only be determined by the voice of antiquity."[1]

To English churchmen the question presented itself in two aspects. First—do we deserve the anathema of Rome? And secondly—if Holy Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation, what is Holy Scripture?

Rainoldes' work is of permanent value. It is indeed a great storehouse of curious learning—biblical, historical, chronological, rabbinical, patristic, scholastic. Each one of the Apocryphal books is given a separate examination, and its

[1] *The Bible in the Church*, p. 257.

claims, external and internal, are carefully weighed. The occasional digressions arising in the course of the discussion are also abounding in interest, though some of them, it must be acknowledged, are to be reckoned rather among the curiosities than the vital questions of learned inquiry. The outrageous mendacity of the literary policy of Romish controversialists, in its forgeries, and in its garbling of patristic and conciliar texts, is now happily a thing of the past; but it needed exposure in the time of Rainoldes.[1] Again, the modern reader may be impatient of such an exhaustive discussion as we find[2] on the question whether the angel in *Tobit* spoke truth when he said that smoke of the fish's liver would expel an evil spirit from man or woman, so that the person would be vexed no more. But the question possessed a real interest for those who still hesitated to deny the potency of precious stones or herbs used for charms. Again, out of the question whether demons are incorporeal arises the inquiry whether the fire of hell is a material fire; and so the reader is led on to discussions on the state of the departed, the meaning of the word *Sheol*, the *limbus patrum*, the appearance of Samuel at Endor, and similar topics.

Rainoldes published other works on the Roman controversy, one of which, *Sex theses de S. Scriptura et Ecclesia*, went through several

[1] See *Prælect.* xliv. [2] *Prælect.* xlviii—lxi.

editions, and was translated into English. As bearing on a question which is discussed again in our own time, a little treatise of his may be mentioned, entitled *Defence of the judgment of the Reformed Churches that a man may lawfully not only put away his wife for her adultery, but also marry another* (1609).

When the history of sacred learning in England comes to be adequately written no inconsiderable place must be devoted to the writings of John Rainoldes.

A contemporary of a different type of churchmanship and of a repute for learning scarcely inferior to Rainoldes is **Richard Field** (1561—1616), Dean of Gloucester. In his own day he was held in the highest estimation; and in modern times we find S. T. Coleridge (writing in 1819 to his son, Derwent), declaring "this one volume, thoroughly understood and appropriated, will place you in the highest ranks of doctrinal Church of England divines (of such as now are), and in no mean rank as a true doctrinal Church historian." Those acquainted with the work referred to will be scarcely inclined to consider the language of Coleridge as over-strained. The title *Of the Church* is not fitted to convey any adequate notion of the character of its contents. It ranges over the whole field of controversy with Rome, starting from the consideration of the *Notes* of the

Church, as laid down by Bellarmine. None of our divines, so far as I know, is better read than Field both in the mediæval Schoolmen and in the later Romish authors; and none is more thoroughly versed in the subtleties of their theological distinctions. He is not one who has dipped into the theological literature of the Middle Ages; he is familiar with its highways and by-ways.

We can detect in Field an irenical tendency. He is singularly free from the abusive language and violent invective against Rome which was general at the time among Anglican controversialists, and which is freely indulged in even by such a writer as Bishop Andrewes. Whatever may have been thought of this moderation in his own day, in ours it will be felt that the force of his treatise is by no means diminished by his calm statement and defence of the Anglican position. He never exaggerates differences; he rejoices to cite statements from authorities in the Roman Church that seem to speak the same, or almost the same language as our own. He shows conclusively that, before the Council of Trent by its definitions hardened and contracted the bounds of doctrinal liberty, there had been not a few eminent thinkers who spoke on many points in the sense of the English Reformers. The *Appendix* to Book III. attempts to establish the paradox "that the Latin or West Church, in which the Pope tyrannized, was and

continued a true, orthodox, and Protestant Church, and that the devisers and maintainers of Romish errors and superstitious abuses were only a *faction* in the same when Luther, not without the applause of all good men, published his propositions against the profane abuse of papal indulgences." But whether Field makes good this strange position or not, it was a very serviceable task to show that the philosophic theologians of the Middle Ages did not speak with one voice, and that "many of the best learned" leaned strongly to opinions afterwards proclaimed by the English Reformers. His object, however, is not, like that of some in later times, to show the identity or nearness of Anglican and Tridentine doctrine, but, on the contrary, to show the wide departure of Tridentine doctrine from the authority of many of the greatest doctors of the Roman Church at an earlier date. This was a new and interesting departure in the line of controversy, and it did something towards recalling Anglican theologians to an acquaintance with a period of theological speculation in the history of the Church which had come to be neglected, and was yet well deserving of study.

In *thoroughness* Field reminds one of Pearson; and like Pearson he demands the closest attention. As to *style*, all that can be said is that he is plain, direct, homely, and, it must be confessed, somewhat heavy. He possesses little

imaginative power, and we are never dazzled by the glittering sallies of fancy that delight us even in the controversial treatises of Andrewes.

In a treatise *Of the Church* at that date, one might have expected much space to be devoted to the Puritan controversy; but Field dismisses it in two or three effective chapters. With much ability he exposes the baseless pretensions to scriptural and patristic authority for the lay ruling-elder. But, while asserting apostolic authority for the superiority of bishops, he maintains, with some of the great Schoolmen, that the superiority is not one of *order* but of *jurisdiction*. The *power* of ordination, according to Field, exists in the presbyter; but in all ordinary cases the *exercise* of that power is *by apostolic warrant* restricted to the bishop. He repudiates "making the distinction of bishops from presbyters a mere human invention, or a thing not necessary, as Aerius did" (Bk. V. c. 27). But in cases of extreme necessity, "as when all bishops are extinguished by death, or, fallen into heresy, obstinately refuse to ordain men to preach the gospel of Christ sincerely," he thinks presbyters may lawfully exercise the power of ordination. In this view Field, so far from being singular, only represented the opinion of the leading divines of his time.[1]

[1] See Hooker (*E. P.* VII. xiv. 11): "Where the Church must needs have some ordained, and neither hath nor can have possibly a bishop to ordain; in case of

Though directed mainly against Romish errors, Field's treatise is not a mere polemic. It is in a high degree constructive. He felt, probably, what we know to be a fact, that the reasoned presentation of positive truth is practically a most effective barrier to the progress of error. If the Romish controversy and the Puritan controversy ceased to exist, Field's work would still remain one of the most valuable contributions to the study of theology which our literature possesses. Wide learning and (what is rarer) sound judgment have left their mark upon every page. Taking him all in all I regard Field as (with the solitary exception of Ussher,) the greatest theologian of the reign of James I.; and this I say, not forgetting the eminence of the writer of whom we have next to speak, and whose influence on the religious thought and sentiment of England has undoubtedly been much more marked,—I mean **Lancelot Andrewes** (1555—1626).

Before the death of Elizabeth, Andrewes' merits, both as a scholar and as a priest, had

---

such necessity the ordinary institution of God hath given oftentimes, and may give place." Similarly, though less distinctly, Andrewes in his second Epistle to Du Moulin: "Cæcus sit qui non videat stantes sine ea [nostrâ politiâ] ecclesias. . . . Non est hoc damnare rem, melius illi aliquid anteponere. Non est hoc damnare vestram ecclesiam, ad formam aliam, quæ toti antiquitati magis placuit, *i.e.* ad nostram, revocare." (*Opusc. Posthuma*, p. 191.)

received recognition. He was made Master of his college (Pembroke, Cambridge) in 1589. He was a favourite preacher at the court of Elizabeth, and before the death of the Queen he was promoted to the Deanery of Westminster. But it was not till 1609 that his first publication saw the light. This was a treatise of controversial divinity against Rome.

James I., though sometimes overruled by his Ministers of State, was personally disinclined to a forcible repression of his Roman Catholic subjects. It is really remarkable that, even after the villainous attempt of the Gunpowder Plot, he was still disposed to favour toleration. But when we pass from the field of physical force to that of reason, the King was quite ready to join issue with the controversialists of Rome. After the horror roused by the discovery of the Powder Plot, Parliament (3 & 4 Jac. I. c. iv.) took fresh measures for the imposing of an oath of allegiance which abjured as impious and heretical what was styled "the damnable doctrine and position, that princes which be excommunicated or deprived by the Pope may be deposed, or murdered by their subjects, or any other whatsoever." Cardinal Bellarmine, the most distinguished Roman controversialist of that age (or indeed, perhaps, of any age), warned English Roman Catholics that to take the oath was to be a traitor to the faith. The King, himself a man of no mean attainment>

and much addicted to theological discussions, replied in an *Apology for the Oath of Allegiance.* To this Bellarmine issued an answer under the assumed name of Matthæus Tortus. The King re-issued his *Apology* with a new Preface, and also directed Andrewes (now Bishop of Chichester) to prepare a reply. This reply (Andrewes' first published work) was issued in 1609 under the title *Tortura Torti.* This was followed in the next year by another controversial treatise from Andrewes' pen, entitled *Responsio ad Apologiam Cardinalis Bellarmini, etc.*[1]

It is due partly to the employment of the Latin tongue, partly to the large space given to merely *argumenta ad hominem*, and still more to the fact that the main object of the discussion is at first sight so remote in our day from men's "business and bosoms," that these two treatises of controversial divinity have attracted comparatively little notice. But the student will find that questions of the deepest significance are involved in the discussion of the papal claim to deprive excommunicated princes—questions which are still alive and exigent, —questions which occupy the foremost controversialists of our own time. What is the

[1] The latter treatise was directed against a reply which Bellarmine had issued, this time under his own name, against the King's Preface to the second edition of his *Apology.*

basis of the papal claim to supremacy? How does it differ from a primacy of the West? What is "the privilege of Peter"? Did it involve temporal jurisdiction? Was it solely personal, or did it extend to his successors? Who are Peter's successors? Are they those who *de facto* have occupied Peter's chair? Do the several changes in the mode of the election of Bishops of Rome (first, by the clergy and people; next, by the intervention of Imperial authority; lastly, by cardinals in conclave) make no difference? Even as to the series of succession doubts arise. Who in fact was St. Peter's *immediate* successor? Was not Pope Liberius a heretic? and Pope Anastasius? and Pope Honorius? and in the days of the schisms which of the *two* Popes—which of the *three*—can we with the absolute confidence of faith assert to be the true successor to St. Peter's "privilege"? These questions and such as these are treated by Andrewes with a fulness and breadth of knowledge, a keenness in perception of intellectual distinctions, a power of argument, that are not often surpassed, or even equalled, in the literature of controversy. Nor is there any lack of the wit, lively raillery, sarcasm, and (more rarely) passionate invective, which readers of Andrewes *Sermons* might naturally look for. Andrewes had personally little inclination for this kind of work; but having taken it in hand he lent his whole powers to the task.

Those who know Andrewes only by name would do well to acquaint themselves with the fervour of his zeal and the brilliance of his attack upon Popery, as exhibited in his controversial treatises. The more sober interpreters of Scripture have learned indeed in later times to hesitate in an application of the prophetic language of Scripture to the Papacy; but to understand Andrewes we must know that he defends the opinion that the Pope is the Antichrist of St. John, and Rome the harlot that sits upon the seven hills—the Rome not of heathen days, but the Rome of the Papacy, drunk with the blood of the saints and martyrs of Jesus Christ, and with blasphemy written on her forehead. And in a fine vein of irony he declares that "Vicar of Christ," as applied to the Pope, is a title too narrow in its application; let it be at once Vice-God,[1] for it is through *him* kings reign; it is *he* that puts down the mighty from their seat. To Peter was said, *Feed My sheep;* that means, says Andrewes, Scatter and disperse them, trample underfoot their pastures, defile the streams of water whence they drink. *Receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven*, for with them ye can admit or exclude from the

[1] The term *Vicedeus* had been applied to Pope Paul V. by Thomas Maria Caraffa in the dedication of his Theses. Andrewes (*Torti Tortura*, p. 443) notices how from the words of the Dedication "*Pa*VL*o* V. VIC*e* D*eo*" the number of the beast may be computed.

kingdoms of earth. *Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven*, every league of iniquity shall be more strictly compacted together at your command. *Whatsoever ye shall loose*—every tie of natural obligation, of duty, of sworn fidelity—*shall be loosed* by your dispensations. Yes, the command came from heaven to Peter, and ye fulfil it—"Rise, Peter, kill!" Again, elsewhere, indulging in that witty play upon words with which his Sermons have made us familiar, he declares that there are doubtless many *sacred* things at Rome, but none more sacred than the *auri sacra fames*. This is the manner in which the author of the incomparable *Devotions* expresses his feelings towards the Papacy.

The admirable monograph of Dean Church[1] spares one from the duty of estimating Andrewes' place in the history of Anglican theology. For breadth of view that comes of accurate knowledge, and for the sympathy with its subject which is essential to true criticism, Dean Church's Lecture deserves a place of the highest rank among just estimates of by-gone times and by-gone men. The reaction against Puritanism, which was manifesting itself in the latter years of Elizabeth, and which found forcible expression in Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, is further emphasized in the writings of Andrewes. But his doctrinal position has been often misunder-

[1] In *Masters in English Theology*, p. 61, *seq.*

stood; and some in our own day who vaunt his name and claim him as an authority for their peculiar theological views, manifest either a very imperfect acquaintance with his writings, or a wilful ignoring of his teaching when it makes against them.

There are many passages in the writings of Andrewes, some of them of a highly rhetorical kind, which taken by themselves may easily mislead. The danger of his day was to underrate the value of the sacraments. The truly reverent mind of Andrewes dreaded that evil, and so he dwells upon their mystical efficacy, their importance, their dignity, their divine appointment. Passages from Andrewes that are supposed to make for the doctrine of the objective Presence of Christ's glorified Body and Blood "in" and "under" the forms of bread and wine, for adoration, for a sacrifice (in the Romish sense) in the celebration of the Eucharist, have been in our own day collected and often exhibited. It is less common to see any notice of passages of another kind, some of them of such a character as (I think) to *rule* and *interpret* the sense of Andrewes elsewhere, unless indeed we will make him inconsistent with himself.

The glowing and enthusiastic ardour of the *Sermons* and *Devotions*, when taken in conjunction with the definite beliefs and denials exhibited elsewhere, and chiefly in the controversial trea-

tises, serves a useful end. It demonstrates that the highest flights of ardent devotion are compatible with convictions which recent innovators among us would hold in pitying contempt, as "low" and "un-catholic." Language, however exalted, will hardly satisfy those to whom I refer when Andrewes denies the true and real presence and *oral* manducation of the Body of Christ under and in the sacramental species,[1] or when he declares, "If a host *could* be turned into Him (Christ) glorified as He is, it would not serve; Christ *offered* is it,—thither must we look, to the serpent lift up, thither we must repair, even *ad cadaver* (to the dead Body of Christ); we must *hoc facere*, do that is then done. So and *no otherwise* is this 'epulare' to be conceived. And *so*, I think, none will say they do or can turn Him."

What is it we partake of in the Eucharist? Andrewes' answer is, "Christ's Body that now is; true; but not Christ's Body *as now it is*, but *as then it was* when it was offered, rent, slain and sacrificed for us. . . . By the incomprehensible power of His eternal Spirit not He alone, but He *as at the very act* of His offering, is made present to us, and we incorporate into His *death* and invested in the benefits of it."[2]

[1] See *Minor Works*, p. 16.

[2] *Sermons*, II. p. 301. The teaching of this passage will be found in many of our great divines, and has in our own day been ably exhibited by Dr. T. S. L. Vogan

On the Eucharistic sacrifice Andrewes' teaching is quite unambiguous. "There is but one only sacrifice, 'veri nominis,' properly so called, that is Christ's death." The Jews prefigured it, we commemorate it. Theirs was a *fore-showing*, ours a *showing-forth* of the Lord's death till He come again.[1] Again, as Andrewes declares, Anglicans (*nostri homines*) believe that the Eucharist was instituted by the Lord not only for our spiritual nourishment, but also for the commemoration of Him, yea of His sacrifice, or, if one may so speak (*si ita loqui liceat*), for a commemorative sacrifice.[2] Andrewes feels that even the phrase "commemorative sacrifice" demands an explanation. Again in the same place he identifies the phrase "commemorative sacrifice" with "commemoration of the sacrifice." The scorn that has been sometimes lavished upon Cranmer and Ridley for similar language should in all fairness be extended to Bishop Andrewes.

On some other questions that now occupy attention, the teaching of Andrewes falls far short of the modern (so-called) "catholic" view. The

(the Bampton Lecturer on the *Doctrine of the Trinity*), in *The True Doctrine of the Eucharist* (1871), and by Canon Trevor in *The Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrifice to Participation of the Holy Eucharist*, issued in its enlarged form (1876) at the request of the venerable Bishop (Williams) of Connecticut, now Presiding Bishop of the American Church.

[1] See *Sermons*, II. p. 300.

[2] *Ad Card. Bellarm. Apol. Responsio*, p. 250.

participation of the sacrament by the people can never be separated, he tells us, from the commemorative sacrifice, both instituted by the Lord at the same time and conjointly. They may not be disjoined the one from the other, *either on account of the negligence of the people* or the avarice of the priests. To participate by *impetration*, that indeed is a novel kind of participating, even more novel than the private mass itself.[1] Or as we have the same teaching in the *Sermons*—"No *celebremus* without *epulemur* in it. If Christ be a propitiatory sacrifice, a peace-offering, I see not how we can avoid but the flesh of our peace-offering must be *eaten* in this feast by us, *or else we evacuate the offering utterly*."[2] The virtue of non-communicating attendance at a celebration was evidently quite unknown to Bishop Andrewes.

Among the posthumous works of Andrewes is an answer to Cardinal Duperron's *Reply* to King James. Here too there is a line taken by Andrewes which must be felt as wholly alien to the teaching which is now striving to find a footing among ourselves. The King had condemned the elevation of the host *adorandi causâ*. Andrewes defended the refusal of "gestes et adorations externes."[3] He was perfectly familiar with the Roman contention that it was Christ *in*

[1] *Ad Card. Bellarm. Apol. Responsio*, p. 250.
[2] *Sermons*, II. p. 299.
[3] *Minor Works*, p. 15.

the sacrament who was adored, and not the sacramental species.

Andrewes in another place contends that even assuming, for argument's sake, transubstantiation followed upon a valid consecration, the uncertainty that attaches to any particular host being validly consecrated is sufficient to justify the refusal of adoration. "If it is *uncertain* whether it is consecrated, it is *uncertain* whether it should be adored; or, rather, it is manifestly *certain* that it should *not* be adored."[1] This may help us to understand what he says elsewhere.[2] "The King has laid down that Christ truly present *in the Eucharist* is to be truly adored; for Christ Himself *wherever* He is, the *res sacramenti*, in and with the Sacrament, out of and without the Sacrament, is to be adored."

Andrewes goes even, perhaps, beyond the language of our formularies in declaring that "the carrying about of the sacrament is *contrary* to the precept of Christ, nor does Scripture anywhere support it. It is *contrary* to the institution, for as the sacrifice was instituted that it should be consumed, so the sacrament that it should be received and eaten, not that it should be reserved and carried about." And then follow very remarkable words. "Beyond the design (*finem*) of the sacrament, beyond the force of the command *no use of it exists.*

[1] *Resp. ad Apol. Bellarm.*, p. 10.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 266.

Let that be done which Christ willed to be done when He said, 'Do this'; let nothing remain which the priest may exhibit out of the pyx, and the people adore."

When we turn from the polemical treatises to the *Sermons* we find Bishop Andrewes at his best. As a controversialist he was capable and skilful; but the same may be said of several of his contemporaries. Controversy gave imperfect scope to the distinctive character of his powers, that welded contexture of intellect, imagination, and emotion, to which we give the name of genius. His fancy was quick, bright, and playful, and its flashes illumine many of his pertinent and incisive comments; but it is generally restrained by his reverence for Holy Scripture. When dealing with any passage of God's word, he dwells upon the utterance, he looks upon it long and lovingly, he turns it over, he views it upon this side and upon that; he believes in its manifold richness and its pregnant depths of meaning. No English preacher has surpassed him in that power of unfolding and drawing out the sense of Scripture which comes only of lengthened study and reverent, brooding meditation. His obligations to preach at Court on Good Friday, and the great festivals of Christmas, Easter, and Whitsunday, if they limited in certain directions the freedom of his choice of subjects, had yet the advantage of fixing his gaze upon the great primary truths of Revelation.

Theology, in the highest sense of the word, the knowledge of God as revealed to us in His Son and in the gift of His Divine Spirit, "the Lord, and Giver of Life," this is his central theme. And to him year after year it was inexhaustible in its depth and in its richness.

The recent discovery and publication (by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge) of an original manuscript of Andrewes' *Greek Devotions*[1] has peculiar interest in making clear for the first time that Andrewes' strong and even violent anti-Roman feeling did not prejudice him against the Church's ancient practice of prayers for the faithful departed.

It will be convenient to call attention here to the admirable defence of the validity of Anglican Orders which appeared in 1613, from the pen of **Francis Mason** (1566—1621), afterwards Archdeacon of Norfolk, under the title, *A Vindication of the Church of England, and of the Lawful Ministry thereof.* A Latin translation (enlarged) followed in 1625. Rome had already commenced the attack upon Anglican Orders; and the "Nag's Head fable" had gained currency. Mason's *Vindication* is thorough and effective; and the merit of the work is testified to by the success of its republication, edited by John Lindsay, in 1728, and again fifty years later. It is an excellent specimen of sound

[1] Admirably edited by Canon Medd (1892).

workmanship ; and it is largely due to Mason that in recent assaults upon Anglican Orders the myths that prevailed at an earlier period have been silently abandoned.

The arrival in England, in 1616, of an archbishop of the Roman communion who renounced his obedience to the Roman see, and accepted office in the Church of England, made, naturally enough, a considerable stir. The story of Marcantonio de Dominis (1566—1624), Archbishop of Spalato, is full of interest, and one of the most curious in the ecclesiastical annals of the period. His publication, after his settling in England, of an elaborate attack upon the Papacy, his assisting in the consecration of English bishops, his appointment to the Deanery of Windsor, his restless ambition, his withdrawal after a few years to the Continent, his submission to Rome, his attack (at least the attack published in his name) upon the Church which he had just left, and his very miserable end are incidents that possess features both grotesque and pathetic.[1] His great work, *De Republica Ecclesi-*

[1] How his conduct was regarded by the High Church writers of England may be illustrated by the language of Montagu (in the "Epistle dedicatory" of his *Invocation of Saints*)—"A man, if any other of his coat and calling, apt enough to be circumcised and deny Christ Jesus if the Grand Signior would but make him Chief Muftie, so much would ambition and covetousness, his bosom infirmities, sway with him." A more favourable view will

astica (1617–20), published in London, extending over more than two thousand folio pages, has been described as "a kind of quarry whence almost everything that can be urged against Ultramontanism may be extracted."[1] But a different colour was given to the interest felt in De Dominis by our divines when after his leaving England he published, or there was published under his name, a violent attack upon her Church, in a work entitled *Expositio consilii sui reditus ex Anglia*.[2] This work, full of railing accusations, was the occasion of the *Defensio Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, by **Richard Crakanthorp** (1569—1624), published, after the author's death, in 1625. It was an easy task to convict De Dominis, as it were, out of his own mouth from the pages of his earlier work; and Crakanthorp is unsparing in driving home his attack. The *Defensio* abounds in wit, sarcasm, and invective, and is not lacking in solid learning. It has received high praise from various authorities; and this much I can say—its arrangement is

---

be found in Barwick's *Life and Death of Bishop Morton* (1660), pp. 85—87.

[1] Dr. John Mason Neale, who adds, "No English divine is acquainted with all that can be said for his own Church who has not studied this book."—*Notes, Ecclesiological and Picturesque, on Dalmatia*, etc., p. 144.

[2] Neale (*ut supra*), p. 147, more than suggests that this work is not from the pen of De Dominis, and that he was poisoned before he could disown it. His body was burned as that of a *relapsed* heretic.

clear, its style lively and entertaining, and (considering the subjects dealt with) it is brief.[1]

The succession of great divines which, as we have seen, had been supplied by Corpus College, Oxford, was not yet to cease. The womb of that breeding mother of theologians had yet another strong son to give to the service of the Church of England in the person of **Thomas Jackson** (1579—1640), who was successively Scholar, Fellow (1606), and President (1630) of that distinguished house. At Corpus his life was almost exclusively spent, save for some seven years while he occupied the important post of Vicar of St. Nicholas (lately erected into the Cathedral Church) at Newcastle-on-Tyne. In 1613 Jackson began to publish what eventually proved to be an extensive series of treatises on theological questions. The connection between these various works is really little more than nominal, though the author wished them to be regarded as "Comments on the Creed."

[1] Anthony Wood (*Athenæ Oxon.*, ii. 362, ed. Bliss) says, "This book was held for the most exact book of controversy since the Reformation." T. Barlow, Bishop of Lincoln (1675—1691), in his *Directions to a Young Divine for his Study of Divinity and choice of Books* (in his *Genuine Remains*, p. 86), writes—"No book I have yet seen has so rational and short an account of almost all popish controversies." The edition in the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology is edited by C[hristopher] W[ordsworth], afterwards Bishop of Lincoln, a lineal descendant of Crakanthorp.

These writings as afterwards collected and presented to the world are in truth a large *miscellany* of divinity, abounding in good learning, ingenious argument, and curious speculation. They are marred by a fault common enough in the preceding generation—an inveterate tendency to discursiveness. The author is quite unable to restrain himself when his path is crossed by some incidental question of interest; and he immediately starts in full cry after this new object of the chase. This occurs again and again, and the effect is highly distracting. The outlines of any plan or system are with difficulty discerned, and the embarrassment is increased by the original editor of the collected *Works*, inserting here and there sermons by the author which he thinks are in some degree allied to the subject in hand. Indeed, as now presented to us, Jackson's twelve Books on the Creed remind one of a set of rambling buildings, constructed by some amateur architect, one piece added here, and, after an interval, another added there; a new wing built on one side and a new outhouse appended to the other; and all devoid of any clear and well-defined plan. To find one's way in such a structure is not easy; and one often comes on unexpected things in unlikely places. Anti-Roman polemics, scattered here and there, occupy a large space; and discussions on the Calvinian doctrine of Predestination with the allied topics are dealt with in

an able manner. We have beside inquiries into the relations of the Church and the State, the interpretation of prophecy, the authenticity of the Old Testament history, the sources of atheism, the nature of evil, justification by faith, the significance of the Levitical ritual, the heathen oracles, the eternity of punishment, the Christian sacraments, dreams as prognostics of truth, and a vast variety of other questions, some important, and others curious and entertaining.

It will be readily admitted that there is much that is valuable and instructive to be found in Jackson's discussions; but it is difficult to understand how one, ordinarily so sane and sober in his bestowment of praise and blame, could use the language applied to our author by Robert Southey when he wrote, "In my judgment the most valuable of all our English divines . . . an author with whom, more almost than any other, one might be contented in a prison." It may be that the unregulated discursiveness that I lament was one of the main attractions for such a miscellaneous, or rather omnivorous reader as Southey. Variety certainly there is in rich abundance.

In his own day Jackson won the admiration of learned and pious men. Good George Herbert declared with warmth, "I speak it in the presence of God, I have not read so hearty, vigorous a champion against Rome, so convincing and demonstrative, as is Dr. Jackson; and I bless

God for the confirmation he hath given me in the Christian religion against the Atheist, Jew, and Socinian." And it was the reputation of Jackson that at length drew from his "cell" Joseph Mead, the recluse of Christ's College, Cambridge, to undertake a journey to the sister University town.[1]

During the reign of James I. and Charles I.—indeed one may extend the observation to the whole of the seventeenth century—among the crowd of distinguished ecclesiastical *literati*, not one for learning reaches the lofty eminence of **James Ussher** (1580—1656). He was indeed "a giant among giants."[2] For erudition, full and exact, in almost every department of ecclesiastical learning—erudition which he handles with the ease of complete mastery—Ussher

[1] In the last century Jones of Nayland, in his *Life of Bishop Horne*, is warm in his commendation of Jackson, and considers that "he deserves to be numbered with the English Fathers of the Church." It may be worth pointing out that Jackson's view of "the real presence" in the Eucharist is that of "a spiritual influence or virtual presence" (Book xi. chap. 3, *Works*, vol. x. p. 27). He teaches that there is not "any other kind of local presence or compresence with these elements than is in baptism. The orthodoxical ancients use the same language for expressing His [*i. e.* Christ's] presence in baptism and in the Eucharist; they stick not to say that Christ is present or latent, in the water, as well as in the elements of bread and wine." *Works*, vol. ix. p. 595.

[2] A. W. Haddan, in his *Life of H. Thorndike.*

stands pre-eminent. The two fascinating volumes of his correspondence[1] show us something of his varied interests in the field of research, and also something of the general admiration in which he was held in the world of letters. Indeed the learning of Europe in the seventeenth century would not be very inadequately represented by the names of those with whom Ussher carried on a scholarly intercourse. There we find Hebraists, Talmudical scholars, and Orientalists, like the younger Buxtorf, Louis de Dieu, L'Empereur, and Capel; inquirers into the early history and antiquity of the Christian Church, classical critics and patristic scholars such as Valois (Valesius),[2] Gerard and Isaac Voss, Saumaise (Salmasius), Gataker, Sir Henry Saville, and the French Protestants, Daillé and Blondel; antiquarians and *bibliophiles*, such as Camden, Bodley, Dugdale, Cotton, Spelman, and Selden; and theologians, such as Andrewes, Mead, John Forbes of Corse, Hammond, Joseph Hall, Bramhall, Cudworth, and Thorndike.

The seventeen volumes of Elrington's edition of Ussher's *Works* exhibit him as a student in many regions of inquiry. But briefly his writings may, for the most part, be grouped in five divisions:—

1. Anti-Roman polemics.
2. Early Christian antiquities.

[1] *Works*, Elrington's edit.

[2] The editor of the text of Eusebius.

18754

3. The ecclesiastical and civil antiquities of Great Britain and Ireland.

4. Chronology.

5. Sermons and other practical and popular treatises.

The natural bent of Ussher's mind was from the first towards historical inquiry. The exigences of the time and of his country forced upon his attention the controversy with Rome. He determined to investigate the problems involved from the historical side. Was the faith of the Papacy the faith of the early Church? To answer this question he resolved at the age of twenty to read right through the whole works of the Christian Fathers. This was a great and arduous undertaking; but, despite distractions of many kinds, he persevered in his task, and accomplished it after eighteen years of labour. At an early age Ussher perceived that the slippery scholastic speculations which occupied so large a place in theological controversy were not the safest standing-ground. He would rest on the surer basis of *facts*, so soon as he could securely ascertain them for himself. What was absent from the faith of the early Church, he concluded, could be none of its essentials. He accepted the maxim of Tertullian, *Verum quodcunque primum; adulterum quodcunque posterius.* And it was on this side he approached the subject of our differences from the modern Romanism of his day.

Ussher's *Answer to a challenge made by a Jesuit in Ireland* (1625) aims at delivering truly "the judgment of antiquity in the points questioned," and exhibiting "the *novelty* of the now Romish doctrine." The student of this and other of his works is soon impressed with the sense that we have here indeed a *master*, one who ranges with the confidence of sure possession over the whole field of patristic and earlier mediæval literature. His critical acumen, naturally keen, and cultivated by exercise, shows itself in his distinguishing genuine from spurious or doubtful authorities; and in this respect none of the earlier English theologians were qualified to compare with him. Again, it is not uncommon to find among those who immerse themselves in the study of patristic authorities an unsteadiness or feebleness of the individual judgment. But Ussher never totters under the weight of his erudition.

In his treatise *Of the Religion anciently professed by the Irish and British* (1631), Ussher dealt with a subject that was peculiarly his own. While still a young man, he began, conjointly with his patristic studies, to collect every document that could help to illustrate the early religious history of the British Isles; and the result of his indefatigable labours took shape in three principal works. There is, first, the treatise named above, written in English, with the view, as he tells us, "to induce my poor countrymen

to consider a little better of the old and true way from whence they have hitherto been misled" (*Works*, iv. 237). Secondly, we have that invaluable storehouse of historical learning, the *Britannicarum Ecclesiarum Antiquitates* (1634), a work which has not been superseded, and which must be constantly in the hands of every student of the Celtic Churches of Great Britain and Ireland. Thirdly, we have the less important *Veterum Epistolarum Hibernicarum Sylloge* (1632), being an interesting collection of some fifty documents, chiefly letters, relating to the early Irish Church.[1]

The most remarkable of Ussher's labours in the field of early Christian antiquity is his contribution to the recovery of the genuine text of the Ignatian Epistles. In our own day the late Bishop Lightfoot, who for learning and critical sagacity reminds us of Ussher himself, has established to the satisfaction of almost all competent scholars the genuineness of what is known as the middle or shorter Greek recension; and certainly on this subject no one is entitled to speak with a greater weight of authority. And it is interesting to find how Lightfoot's judgment, generally of a temper cold and severe, catches fire when he comes to speak of Ussher. "By Ussher's labours," writes Lightfoot, "the question between the long and middle recension was, or ought to

[1] A new edition of this work, with illustrative notes, would be welcomed by scholars.

have been, set at rest for ever. Altogether [his work] showed not only marvellous erudition, but also the highest critical genius."[1] After this testimony it would be a sensibly felt descent to cite the eulogies pronounced by men of lesser name; but that Ussher established his main contention to the satisfaction of such critics as Grotius and Voss, Pearson and Bull, Bentley and Waterland, is no small triumph.

Before passing from this subject I may be allowed to point out how the extraordinarily wide reach of Ussher's reading served him in this particular branch of research. The inquirer into the earliest relics of Christian literature might well be excused if he did not look to the ecclesiastical documents of England in the Middle Ages as a quarter from which it was likely that any light would be thrown upon his researches. Yet it was Ussher's acquaintance with the writings of Grostête, Bishop of Lincoln in the middle of the thirteenth century, and of such obscure authors as Wycliffe's opponents, Wodeford and Tissington, that set him on the track which led to the recovery of the lost epistles of Ignatius. The man of genius who is full of his subject sees mysterious hints and suggestions where to the ordinary reader all is void, featureless, and jejune. Clues to the object of his search are furnished by intimations as unapparent or unmeaning to others, as the tokens and marks in the forest hunting-grounds

[1] *St. Ignatius*, vol. i., p. 233.

by which the trained senses of the savage tracks his prey. The thrill of pleasure as step by step he is led to success is not disguised by Ussher, and the natural, though restrained, expression of his feelings illumines and brightens with a glow of personal interest the close-knit argument of the great Dissertation.[1]

Ussher had been brought up under the influence of Calvinistic teachers of an extreme type. Archbishop Loftus, the first Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, was one the complexion of whose churchmanship may be gathered from the fact that Cartwright was his chaplain. The second Provost was Walter Travers, Hooker's opponent at the Temple Church. It is not very surprising that young Ussher imbibed the notions of his teachers; but it is more surprising that in later times he was able to free himself from the convictions of his earlier years.[2] In the same year (1631) in which appeared his work on the *Religion of the Ancient Irish and British Churches*, there appeared also his history of the Gottskalk controversy of the ninth century, a solid and valuable piece of work, though plainly written with a Calvinistic bias.[3]

[1] *Dissertatio non de Ignatii solum et Polycarpi Scriptis, sed etiam de Apostolicis Constitutionibus et Canonibus Clementi Romano tributis* (1644).

[2] Bishop Sanderson underwent a similar change of opinion. His earlier treatises are distinctly marked by Calvinism.

[3] *Gotteschalci et predestinatianæ controversiæ ab eo motæ*

The ability and vast erudition displayed in Ussher's chronological researches are acknowledged equally among continental and English scholars. But any estimate of their value as furnishing ultimate statements must be left to specialists in that difficult department of inquiry. In his *Annales Veteris Testamenti* we have one of the earliest attempts to reduce to system the chronology of the Old Testament history as represented by the Hebrew text; and it may be observed that it is substantially the dates as supplied by Ussher that are now to be seen in the margins of nearly all editions of the English Bible.[1]

Ussher was nominated by Parliament to be a member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines; but he refused to attend it, and declared further that that gathering was both illegal and in its tendency schismatical. In revenge his library was confiscated by Parliament; and though, through the generosity of John Selden and others, it was bought back, or in some other way saved, for the Primate, it was found that many of his valued manuscripts had been removed. When we consider the anxieties of Ussher's position, the turbulent times in which

historia. In this volume Ussher gave to the world for the first time the original text of Gottskalk's two confessions.

[1] These chronological notes first appeared in Bishop Lloyd's edition of the Bible, 1701.

he lived, and the many hardships of his later years, one marvels the more at his unremitting literary labours continued up to the very last.[1] Perhaps it may have been with Ussher, as in instances known to some of us, that the remote, out-of-the-world inquiries of learned research made for him a kind of asylum against the shocks of fate—a haven of refuge where he could forget the tempests and wild waves that raged without.

A short tract of Ussher's written as early as 1641 (but not published till the year after his death) is better known to the general public interested in ecclesiastical affairs than any of his more learned treatises. It is entitled *The Reduction of Episcopacy unto the form of Synodical Government received in the Ancient Church.*[2] Its original purpose was to suggest a modification of the then form of episcopal government which he hoped might have averted the approaching ecclesiastical revolution. Its interest to us now lies chiefly in its exhibition of practical sagacity combined with sound learning in anticipating very largely the actual course adopted by every branch of the Anglican communion

[1] He was at work on the *Chronologia Sacra* till the evening twilight failed him on the day before his death. From his study he passed to another room in the house to offer spiritual consolation to a dying person. Before two o'clock the next day (March 21, 1656) he himself had ceased to breathe. His last audible words were, "O Lord, forgive me, especially my sins of omission."

[2] *Works*, xii. pp. 527—536.

throughout the world, that has, through disestablishment or otherwise, been freed from the control of the State. And it is plain also that the Church of England is, so far as may be, moving in the same direction. Ussher, as might have been expected from one so thoroughly versed in the literature of primitive Christianity, maintained that the episcopal form of Church government was established by the apostles, and indeed, he added, "confirmed by Christ Himself."[1] But he was evidently convinced of the evils growing from the autocratic power of bishops, and desired a return to the more fraternal relations of bishops and presbyters, as manifested in the early Church.

[1] Ussher held that "the *angels* of the seven churches" to whom Christ is represented in the Apocalypse as sending epistles were bishops ; and it may be questioned whether Bishop Lightfoot has shown any satisfactory reason for questioning that ancient belief. See *Works*, vii. 43, *seq.*

LECTURE IV

Montagu—Laud as a theologian—Chillingworth—Joseph Hall—Jeremy Taylor—Cosin—Bramhall—Hammond—Brian Walton and his colleagues—John Lightfoot—Beveridge—Thorndike—Stillingfleet.

NOTHING could have been more unfortunate for the interests of the Church of England in the seventeenth century than the association of many of its leading divines with those theories of political government which took shape in the crude assertion of "the divine right of kings" and of the doctrine of "passive obedience." All this was in truth a retrograde movement from the political doctrines of the greater mediæval Schoolmen and from the moderate teaching of Hooker. It seemed in the popular view to connect the Church with a policy that was arbitrary and tyrannical. In its extreme form it alienated thousands of sober-minded and sensible men. It threw many who would otherwise have been loyal churchmen into the arms of the Puritan party. It rendered men suspicious and hostile towards the teaching of those who

claimed divine authority for action that was harsh and oppressive, if not unconstitutional.

By many ecclesiastics the divine right of *tithes* was urged together with the divine right of the hereditary monarchy. When Selden[1] with incomparable learning, proceeding cautiously on purely historical evidence, denied that tithes were exacted in the early Christian Church, **Richard Montagu** (1578—1641), afterwards Bishop of Norwich, entered the lists on behalf of the clergy.[2] I will not lead you into this outworn controversy: it must suffice to say that this work first called attention to the abilities of a very able controversialist whose name afterwards came to figure largely in the politics of the time.

The action of Parliament with respect to Montagu's two later treatises—*Of Invocation of Saints* (1624) and *Appello Cæsarem* (1625)—is part of the civil history of England. But the contents of the volumes themselves are little known. Nor has Montagu received the consideration which these and, more especially, his other learned labours deserve. He had assisted Sir H. Saville in the production of his great (Eton) edition of St. Chrysostom (1610—1613), one of the glories of the learning of the period, and had himself edited the Greek text of the *Two Invectives of St. Gregory Nazianzen against*

[1] *The History of Tithes*, 1618.

[2] *Diatribe on the first part of Selden's History of Tithes*, 1621.

Julian (1610). His *Analecta Ecclesiasticarum Exercitationum* (1622), written with an eye to the great work of Baronius, proved him to be well versed in the early history of the Church.[1] But from these writings one could not have inferred his powers as a keen, animated, and witty controversialist, addressing himself to the popular ear.

Some Roman priests, who had been attempting to proselytize among the "weaker sex" in his parish (Stamford Rivers in Essex), put out a pamphlet, entitled *A new Gag for an old Gospel*, in which they attributed to the Church of England a large number of doctrinal propositions which, though they were in truth the opinions of many individuals, had never been authorized by the Church. Among these propositions were several Calvinistic and Sabbatarian pronouncements. Montagu replied[2] by showing that such opinions were not the doctrines of the Church's authentic formularies. In the judgment of the ablest historian who has dealt with this period, Montagu's reply was in its matter "a temperate exposition of the reasons which were leading an increasing body of scholars to reject the doctrines of Rome and

[1] At a later period, though an active and faithful bishop, he found time to publish other historical works showing much research and considerable critical power.

[2] *A gagg for the new Gospel? No, a new gagg for an old goose*, 1624.

of Geneva alike."[1] Montagu puts the matter well in his *Appello Cæsarem*, published the following year (1625). He declares that he had replied "with a firm purpose to leave all private opinions . . . unto their own authors or abettors, either to stand or fall of themselves; and not to suffer the Church of England to be charged with the maintenance of any doctrine, which was none of her own, publicly and universally resolved on." Alluding to the law in force at the time for the maintenance of foundling children, he says that the Puritans had supposed, "as it would seem, that in this case we were all liable to the Statute, that is, bound to keep and foster *their* conceits as *our own* doctrines, because they have cast them upon us and upon our Church, like bastards upon the parish where they were born." (*Epistle Dedicatory.*)

The action here attributed to the Puritans was much like attempts on the part of some persons in our own day to father upon the Church of England certain doctrinal *enfants trouvés* whose complexion and features, with the rags in which they are wrapped, strongly suggest an Italian parentage. *Our* appeal, as was Montagu's, is to the authoritative formularies of the Church—the Articles of Religion and the Book of Common Prayer. Montagu, in his *Appello Cæsarem*, examines the Articles and the Prayer-book, and very effectively makes

[1] S. R. Gardiner, *The Duke of Buckingham*, etc., i. 206.

good his position that they do not teach, but rather contravene the doctrine of God's "irrespective decree" and its Calvinistic corollaries;[1] and, while speaking with respect of the Synod of Dort, he makes clear that its determinations did not touch the members of the Church of England.

When Montagu replies to the charge of Romanizing he has a more difficult task, for though generally making a good defence, he had himself occasionally used indiscreet language, capable of being readily misunderstood.[2] And, as is well known, his book the *Appello Cæsarem* was eventually called in by order of the King. But how far Montagu is removed from sympathy with *Popery* (as distinguished from certain doctrinal positions generally though incorrectly associated in men's minds with the Roman Church) may be gathered from all his principal works. For the purpose in hand it is merely a scholastic question whether the Pope is *the* Antichrist, or only *an* Antichrist, as Montagu asserts.[3] Montagu may, I think, be taken

[1] He anticipates in some measure Archbishop Laurence's *Bampton Lectures*.

[2] For example, his employment of the word "transelementation" applied to the change in the Eucharist. (*Appello Cæsarem*, p. 292.)

[3] "I will not deny that the Pope is *an* Antichrist. I do not deny it: I do believe it." *Appello Cæsarem* (p. 144). He refers to St. John's statement, "now are *many* Antichrists."

among theologians of distinction as touching the high-water mark of the movement which in the earlier half of the seventeenth century sought to minimize the doctrinal differences between the Anglican and the Roman Communions. The influences at Court at the time ran in that direction; and an ambitious man would be under considerable temptations to adopt that line. But it is not here suggested that Montagu's convictions were not genuine.

During the later years of the reign of James I. and the early years of that of Charles, the Church of Rome and its claims were kept much in the thoughts of Englishmen. James, despite his early controversial treatises, was strongly suspected of Romeward leanings. The proposed "Spanish match" for the prince, and his subsequent marriage to Henrietta Maria, were taken as signs. And the known activity of Romish proselytizers among the nobility, followed by several fashionable conversions, increased the anxieties of English churchmen. The Jesuit Percy (better known by his assumed name of Fisher), himself a convert to Rome, and with all a convert's zeal, had influenced, among others, the Countess of Buckingham, mother of George Villiers, the King's favourite. It was arranged that a disputation, in the presence of this lady, or, as it was called, a "conference," should be held (May 1622), between Fisher and some Anglican theologians. Francis White, afterwards

Bishop of Ely, has left an account of the earlier stages of the conference; but, certain important questions having been left unhandled, a third day of debate was appointed, on which occasion the Anglican champion was **William Laud** (1573—1645), at that time Bishop of St. Davids. The King, who still heartily enjoyed a controversial encounter, and several courtiers of rank were present. The result, with some enlargements, were afterwards given to the world by Laud.

Laud's subsequent position as an ecclesiastical statesman and the leading mind in ordering and regulating, whether for good or ill, the policy and administration of the Church of England in troublous times, has tended to obscure his place as a theologian and a man of learning. He had been a diligent student of the Roman controversy, as is borne witness to by his copious Latin *marginalia* to Bellarmine's *Disputationes*.[1] Laud was armed and ready for the battle. He tells us that he had not "the full time of four-and-twenty hours to bethink himself," for the command of the King had been sudden; but the labours of the patient student and thinker of earlier days now served him in good stead.

The *Conference with Fisher* is marked throughout by a reasonableness and masculine good

[1] The volumes are now in Archbishop Marsh's Library in Dublin. The notes were transcribed for the A. C. L. edition of Laud's works.

sense which might not be expected by those who know Laud only through the partisan pages of certain popular historians.[1] Laud was learned, but he was no mere "bookman," to use a word of his own; and in this controversy he does not suffer from being a man of the world, accustomed to observe, to consider, and to judge the facts of life and history. But, it seems to me, the chief interest that now attaches to the *Conference*, is the light that it throws on the general attitude of mind, and particular beliefs, of the most prominent high-churchman of his day. No one was ever a more staunch and loyal son of the Church of England. No one ever saw more clearly the hopeless impossibility of approaches towards Rome, while Rome remains what she is.

Laud, as is well known, was zealous in promoting, by example as well as by injunction, all that might advance the beauty and solemn dignity of the public worship of God. By this many in his own day were misled. But it might have sufficed to show that there is no necessary connection between Romanizing and a sense of the value of ritual and ceremonious observance to find Chillingworth, in his *Religion*

[1] At length students of the history of England have in Mr. S. R. Gardiner's great work a truly scholarly and (as far perhaps as is possible in writing the story of such troublous times) impartial account of the reigns of James and Charles. Mr. Gardiner makes clear that Laud, with all his rigour as to obedience to Church rule, was in true sympathy with large doctrinal latitude.

of Protestants, defending the desire "to adorn and beautify the places where God's honour dwells, and to make them as heaven-like as they can with earthly ornaments." And Laud's writings leave no doubt as to his anti-Roman convictions. To take a crucial example—in the Eucharist Laud sees no other sacrifice than (1) the "memory" (*i. e.* memorial) of the sacrifice of Calvary; (2) the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; and (3) the sacrifice of ourselves, our souls and bodies.

And again—"This sacrament is commemorative of the Lord's passion (which was *a true sacrifice*), and so it is *called* a sacrifice."

And, once again, in our time, when some would denounce the establishment of an episcopate holding the doctrine of our reformed Church in places where bishops of the Roman obedience can show an undoubted historical succession, it may be well to call to mind the declaration of this leading high-churchman of the seventeenth century. "Most evident it is," writes Laud, "that the succession which the Fathers meant is not tied to a place or a person, but it is tied to *the verity of doctrine;* for so Tertullian expressly: 'Beside the order of bishops running down (in succession) from the beginning, there is required *consanguinitas doctrinæ*, that the *doctrine* be allied in blood to that of Christ and His apostles.' So that if the *doctrine* be no kin to Christ, all the succession becometh

strangers, what nearness soever they pretend. . . . If that only be a legitimate succession which holds the unity of the faith entire, then the succession of pastors in the Roman Church is illegitimate." (*Against Fisher*, § 39.)

Fisher, the active and clever Roman proselytizer, had been busy not only among people of fashion, from whom converts were made, like Lady Buckingham, Lady Falkland, and Lord Purbeck, but also among young men at the University. In fact the picture of those days is not unlike that which was presented some fifty years ago in the frequent conversions to Rome among similar classes in England. Among the converts at the University was a young Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, a godson of Laud, and one who afterwards became famous as the author of *The Religion of Protestants*—**William Chillingworth** (1602—1644).

Chillingworth, after his conversion, was induced by Fisher to repair to the Romish College at Douai, where his faith might be strengthened and consolidated. But the result did not answer the expectations formed. A further acquaintance with Romanism opened his eyes.

It requires more moral courage to retrace one's steps and come back, discredited for haste and inconstancy, than to make the first change. But Chillingworth, like some others in later times, could not but follow where he was led by

what he believed to be truth. He returned to England and the English Church.

The title of Chillingworth's famous book, *The Religion of Protestants, a Safe Way to Salvation* (1638), was suggested by that of a little book by a Jesuit (who wrote under the name of Edward Knott), *Charity mistaken, with a want wherof Catholicks are unjustly charged for affirming, as they do with grief, that Protestancy unrepented destroys salvation* (1630).[1] Knott supported his book by a subsequent publication entitled *Mercy and Truth, or Charity maintained by Catholics* (1634). It is more particularly against this second work that Chillingworth's treatise is directed. After the manner more common in a previous age than in Chillingworth's day, he reprinted his opponent's book chapter by chapter, to each chapter adding his own reply.

Chillingworth's main contention is that all the truths essential to salvation are taught in Holy Scripture (so far he only stated the authoritative doctrine of the Church of England); and, further, that those truths are so clearly taught therein as to be readily discovered by every intelligent and honest inquirer. If they are not clearly taught, they are not essential. Further, "all necessary points of mere belief" are contained in the Apostles' Creed, which creed, we may notice in passing, Chillingworth assumes to have

[1] Knott's book was replied to in 1633 by Dr. Christopher Potter, Provost of Queen's College, Oxford.

been composed by the Apostles. Here are certainly questionable propositions, propositions that need very full explanation, propositions that say both too much and too little.

When inquiry is made, "What is Holy Scripture? How are we to know that these books are Holy Scripture, having God's authority?" Chillingworth replies, and here rightly, that we conclude what is Holy Scripture on grounds of natural reason, reason judging by historical evidence, that evidence being found in the judgment of the ancient universal Church. When the Romanist cries in triumph, "This is to make the Church the judge," he answers, "I have told you already that of this controversy we make the Church the judge; but not the present Church, and less the present Roman Church, but the *consent and testimony* of the ancient and primitive Church." And, he adds, in words very characteristic of the man, "though it be but an highly probable inducement and no demonstrative enforcement, yet methinks you should not deny but it may be a *sufficient* ground of faith."[1] In a similar rational spirit, speaking of "the questioned books" of the New Testament, he writes, "I may believe even those questioned books to have been written by the apostles and to be canonical; but I cannot in reason believe this of them *so undoubtedly* as of those books which were never questioned." "Yet," he adds,

[1] *Works* (ed. 1838), i. 385.

in words that remind one of passages in Newman's *Grammar of Assent*, "all this I say not as if I doubted that the Spirit of God, being implored by devout and humble prayer and sincere obedience, may and will by degrees advance His servants higher, and give them a *certainty of adherence* beyond their *certainty of evidence*. But what God gives as a reward to believers is one thing, and what He requires in all men as their duty is another."

One other characteristic passage may be cited. "For my part, I am certain that God hath given us our reason to discern between truth and falsehood; and he that makes not this use of it, but believes things he knows not why, I say it is by chance that he believes the truth and not by choice; and that I cannot but fear that God will not accept of this *sacrifice of fools*." [1]

The import of Chillingworth's thought is pertinent to controversies that are deeper and more fundamental than that with Rome. From the passages cited one can understand how he was so warmly admired by such a simple and devoted lover of truth for truth's sake, and such a typical English thinker, as John Locke. The whole work is, in effect, a homily on the profoundly important theme, the responsibility of the intellect in matters of religion.

It seems to me that the chief value of Chillingworth for our day is to be found in the

[1] Vol. i. p. 237.

moral impetus given by the study of his writings, in the influence of his transparent love of truth and his ardour in its search, which with honest hearts is infectious. Nor can one fail to admire his resolve to bring himself into a strict relation with facts. If evidence be insufficient, he never will allow his desires to add one grain to the scale. Again, with him, as with Butler, it is a maxim that "*probability* is the very guide of life." Faith may be weak and imperfect, and yet sufficient to please God. *Others* "pretend that heavenly things cannot be seen to any purpose but by the midday light; but *God* will be satisfied if we receive any degree of light which makes us leave the works of darkness and walk as children of the light: *they* exact a certainty of faith above that of sense or science; *God* desires only that we believe the conclusion as much as the premises deserve; that the strength of our faith be equal or proportionable to the credibility of the motives to it."[1]

The value of the *Religion of Protestants* as a permanent contribution to the Romish controversy seems to me to have been generally overrated. But the success and popularity of the book can be readily accounted for. It possessed the charm of being apparently "a short and easy method" of dealing with matters of dispute that had been commonly exhibited in huge folios, bristling with quotations from the Greek and

[1] Vol. i. p. 115.

Latin Fathers, which few could read and still fewer could appraise at their true value. Its masculine power and logical coherence were impressive. It was written in admirable English, always simple and clear, generally forcible, and occasionally rising to real eloquence. And its moral earnestness and wide charity must always attract many.[1]

Of the divines of the seventeenth century no one, with the exception perhaps of Jeremy Taylor, has been so successful in gaining the ear of what is called "the religious public" as **Joseph Hall** (1574—1656), Bishop of Norwich; and his deserved success is easily accounted for. His practical and devotional works, such as the *Contemplations* on the Old and New Testaments, and the *Meditations and Vows*, will be read so long as sincerity, acumen, and sound sense expressing themselves in luminous English, have attractions for good men. Hall's works are impregnated with the most effective antiseptic against the decays of time—the salt of an admirable style. His merits as a writer of powerful verse are generally acknowledged; and, as the history of English literature amply demonstrates, it is indeed rare when one who knows how to

[1] A highly appreciative and, on the whole, just estimate of Chillingworth will be found in Tulloch's *Rational Theology in England* (second edition), vol. i. pp. 261—343. See also Sir J. Fitzjames Stephen's *Horæ Sabbaticæ* (first series), pp. 187—208.

handle verse is deficient in his mastery of prose. Hall's prose style is simple, forcible, and charmingly clear. He is less ornate than Taylor, but he is more concise, more pertinent, more lucid. The exuberant fancy of Taylor is lacking, but Hall is not deficient in a considerable power of imaginative illustration, and his sane judgment rarely offends our sense of fitness.

Hall's less known works, including his controversial treatises against Rome, such as *The Old Religion* (a model of systematic arrangement), the *Honour of the Married Clergy;* and his numerous courageous tractates in defence of Episcopacy and the Liturgy, and those against Presbyterianism and the extravagances of Protestant dissent, are full of good learning and spirited writing. Among the parties in the Church he generally followed the course which gave the name to one of his books, the *Via Media*.[1] Hence, as in the case of other men of independence, his reputation has had to endure studied attempts at depreciation from party-men of opposite schools.[2] Hall's Latin style does

[1] *Via media : the way of peace in the five busy Articles of Arminius.*

[2] Hall's little tract, entitled *An Explication of Christ's presence in the sacrament of His Body and Blood*, is worth reading. His wholesome dislike of obscurantism—of deliberate obfuscation of the intellect on the plea of devoutness—expresses itself in the pointed words, "Away with those nice scruplers, who, for some further ends, have endeavoured to keep us in undue suspense with a *non licet inquirere de modo*."

not aim at following the Ciceronian model, but it is terse, elegant, and, above all, serviceable. Speaking generally, Hall did not add to the theological learning of England, but served the useful office of one of the middle-men of literature, arranging and popularizing the results of others' labours.[1]

So long as the English tongue is spoken the name of **Jeremy Taylor** (1613—1667) must carry with it a great reputation. It may be safely said that none of our divines was so richly endowed with the rare combination of intellectual force, imaginative fertility, and emotional fervour.

But here we are not concerned in estimating his genius save in relation to our special subject. And it must be acknowledged, in the first place, that in many instances Taylor's display of wonderful powers is but very imperfectly accompanied by the sound *judicial faculty*, which is, after all, a primary essential in theological inquiry. Taylor is a rhetorician, and an advocate of a high order of excellence, incomparable in the presentation of his case; but he accepts from himself his own brief, too often after very immature consideration. None, perhaps, of our accredited divines commits himself so frequently to unsustained, insecure, or highly questionable statements. His reading, as Coleridge observes, was "oceanic; but he read rather to bring out

[1] A notice of Hall's casuistical writings will be found later on.

the growth of his own fertile and teeming mind than to inform himself respecting the products of those of other men."[1] Hence the careful student soon learns to be on the alert in examining the authors cited, if he cares to ascertain whether their full sense—their real sense—has been caught and expressed by this great devourer of books. Again, the copiousness of his style leads him to excess, and at times we can hardly acquit him of verbosity, while arguments good, bad, and indifferent are piled one upon another.

In such a mind as Taylor's exact consistency is scarcely to be looked for; and as matter of fact we find more than one instance in his works where he seems to contradict himself, and to be unaware of the contradiction.

When we remember that Taylor died in his fifty-fifth year the productiveness of his pen is indeed marvellous. He has given the world not only many works, but many which will live.

Taylor's wide-spread reputation is, no doubt, largely due to his practical and devotional writings. His *Holy Living*, his *Holy Dying*, and (though in a less degree) his *Golden Grove* have suffered little in general estimation through the lapse of time. The consideration of these and of his *Worthy Communicant* and his *Collection of Offices* must not occupy us here. Nor

[1] *Notes on English Divines*, i. p. 209.

can we delay to speak of his *Life of Christ*, or his wonderful *Sermons*, though in both of these works much will be found of interest to students of theology. His *magnum opus* on which he himself expected that his reputation would chiefly rest—the *Ductor Dubitantium*—will be briefly noticed in another connection.

The *Liberty of Prophesying* (1647) is in many respects Taylor's most remarkable work.[1] It was the immediate outcome of the oppressions (beginning about 1641) which the Church suffered at the hands of the dominant Puritan party. The subsequent attempt to enforce the Solemn League and Covenant in effect deprived and silenced the great body of the best of the English clergy. In 1645 the use of the Book of Common Prayer was, by an Ordinance of Parliament, forbidden whether in public or in any private place or family under heavy penalties, and the Presbyterian *Directory* was substituted in its room. This tyrannous persecution called forth from Taylor, first, his *Episcopacy Asserted* (1642), and afterwards, with its bold and aggressive title, *An Apology for authorized and set forms of Liturgy against the pretence of the Spirit for extempore prayer, etc.* (1646). Indeed Taylor was one of the most fearless of men. His contempt and scorn for the ignorance and hypocrisy of too many of the preachers of the Presbyterian

[1] In Bishop Heber's judgment, this is "the most curious, and perhaps the ablest of all his compositions."

party he never cared to hide ;[1] and his successive imprisonments made the reply of his opponents.

But Taylor was led by the intolerance of the Puritans, and possibly by the recollection of instances of intolerance when his own party had been in power, to examine the whole question of the rights, civil and ecclesiastical, of restraining the expression of religious opinion. The result was the *Liberty of Prophesying*.

A main contention of this remarkable work is that the interference of the State should be exercised only when doctrines injurious to its own well-being were publicly taught. "Religion," he tell us, "is to meliorate the condition of the people ; and therefore those doctrines that inconvenience the public are no parts of true religion." "Whatsoever is against the foundation of faith, or contrary to good life and the laws of obedience, or destructive to human society and just interests of bodies politic, is out of the limits of my question, and does not pretend to compliance or toleration : so that I allow no indifferency, nor any countenance to those religions whose principles destroy government, nor to those religions (if there be any such) that teach ill life." Thus Taylor would not have the State interfere with those who taught the sinfulness of infant baptism, or those who taught the doctrine of transubstantiation ;

[1] See even the preface, "to the pious and devout reader," of the *Golden Grove*.

but it is different if any taught doctrines subversive of civil government, such as that the Pope may absolve subjects from their allegiance to their natural prince, that heretical princes may be slain by their subjects, that the Pope may dispense with all oaths, and that faith is not to be kept with heretics. "These opinions," he declares, "are a direct overthrow to all human society and mutual commerce, a destruction of government and of the laws." Yet even here (so great is Taylor's desire for tolerance) he would not have interference if men "held their peace" and entertained these as only speculative opinions. Similarly Anabaptists' notions as to the unlawfulness of a magistrate ministering an oath, or the State using defensive arms, and such like, are not to be treated in the same way as their opinions on baptism. These notions are "as much to be rooted out as anything that is the greatest pest and nuisance to the public interest." Taylor's principle is thoroughly intelligible; and differences will now-a-days arise only in the extent of its application.

It is when Taylor passes from the consideration of State policy to the terms of ecclesiastical communion that there will be most disposition to demur to his conclusions. He shows indeed that a large variety of teaching on certain subjects is allowed in all religious bodies. He would extend this liberty very widely, asking only for agreement in *fundamentals;* and these

fundamentals he, like Chillingworth, reduces to the doctrines taught in the Apostles' Creed. It is obvious that the question thus raised is too large to be discussed here; but Taylor's treatment of it is well worthy of the closest attention in our own day.

How are we to attain such certitude as to the absolute truth of doctrines lying beyond fundamentals, that we may make bold to impose them on others, as essentials? Arguments from Scripture, Taylor urges, are difficult and uncertain in questions "not simply necessary." Tradition is insufficient to end controversies; similarly ecclesiastical councils are insufficient. The Pope is not infallible. The ancient Fathers are an insecure guide. Reason, using all suitable aids, is the best judge. Reason, indeed, may err. Yet we must remember, "it is not required of us not to be in error, but that we endeavour to avoid it." The discussion on "the nature and measures of heresy" is throughout extremely able, and proceeds upon the principles that reason erring may be inculpable, and that "heresy is not an error of the *understanding*, but an error of the *will*." Taylor's charity is a charity that has its basis in natural justice, and in its ardour bursts through all the restraints of mere legal and ecclesiastical technicalities.

Taylor's farthest stretch of (so-called) "liberal theology," though it has alarmed many, does not surpass, nay, does not reach the utterance of a

well-known divine of our own time who has never been suspected of dangerous liberalism in theology, the late Dr. Pusey. "Ask any tolerably-instructed Christian person, and his instinct will respond what every teacher of the Church everywhere knows to be truth. Ask him, 'Will any soul be lost, heathen, idolater, heretic, or in any form of hereditary unbelief or misbelief, if in good faith he was what he was, living up to that light which he had, whencesoever it came, and repenting him where he did amiss?' All Christendom would answer you, God forbid!"[1]

In the course of his argument, Taylor has to deal with the claims made on behalf of papal infallibility (*Works*, v. 462, *seq.*). The discussion is comparatively brief, but nothing more effective can be found in any of our earlier writers; and if he allows some fine flashes of irony to play round the absurdities of the position (and more particularly round the logical process by which the infallibility of the Popes is deduced from the promises made to St. Peter), it is only for a little while, for he recalls to mind "this is not a business to be merry in."[2]

On the whole there is perhaps no work in our Anglican theological literature more sure to arrest and hold attention, more stimulating,

[1] *The Responsibility of the intellect in matters of Faith.* (Oxford, 1873.) See the whole splendid passage, pp. 36—46.

[2] See *Works*, v. 462, *seq.*

more provocative of thought than the *Liberty of Prophesying;* as there is certainly no more brilliant manifestation of Taylor's intellectual powers.[1]

In his *Unum Necessarium, or the Doctrine and Practice of Repentance* (1655), Taylor expressed himself on the nature of original sin and the extent of man's corruption in a manner which it is difficult to reconcile with the teaching of the Church in her Articles of Religion. The Bishop of Rochester (John Warner) and the Bishop of Salisbury (Brian Duppa), to whom he inscribed the volume, each wrote to Taylor letters expressing strong disapprobation of the views set forth; and it is said that the wise and learned Sanderson was moved even to tears by what he considered Taylor's departure from the scriptural language of the Church. In our own day Coleridge came to the conclusion that Taylor's system was "*bonâ fide* Pelagianism," though of course Taylor had denied the imputation. It is impossible in this place to discuss the question raised; but I shall venture to say that Taylor's language, though incautious, seems to me capable of a more favourable construction.

In his earlier years Taylor had for a time

[1] When the student has mastered the *Liberty of Prophesying* for himself he may consult with advantage S. T. Coleridge's *Notes on English Divines;* Tulloch's *Rational Theology;* and Sir J. Fitzjames Stephen's *Horæ Sabbaticæ* (First Series).

been thrown into close contact with Roman Catholics. It is said, indeed, that at one period he lived on terms of intimate friendship with the clever Franciscan, Christopher Davenport (better known as Sancta Clara), one of the chaplains of Queen Henrietta Maria.[1] And all through Taylor's life the suspicion of Romanizing tendencies haunted his reputation with the general public. But in truth his capacity for generously appreciating and acknowledging good points in Romanism made him a far more formidable opponent than writers blinded by the bigotry of extravagant Protestantism.

In 1654 there appeared the first edition of Taylor's work, entitled, *The real and spiritual presence of Christ in the blessed Sacrament proved against the doctrine of Transubstantiation.* The phrase "real presence," which had already been occasionally adopted by Anglican writers, but was more commonly appropriated to the Roman doctrine, Taylor now, whether wisely or

[1] Sancta Clara was author of many theological works, but is now remembered chiefly for his *Paraphrastica Expositio Articulorum Confessionis Anglicanæ* (1646), a hopeless and somewhat ludicrous attempt to interpret the XXXIX. Articles in a sense compatible with the doctrines which they were, in the main, expressly written to condemn. This book, with an English translation, was republished by Dr. F. G. Lee in 1865. The book has been justly described as "a mere trick of proselytizing controversy, and not a wise trick either." (*The Guardian*, March 28, 1866.)

unwisely, claims as the expression of the doctrine of the Church of England. Taylor's arguments against transubstantiation need not here engage our attention; but it may be interesting and serviceable to state his own position, his own positive teaching; and this can be done effectively by a few quotations.

"We ['sons of the Church of England'] by the real spiritual presence of Christ do understand Christ to be present, as the Spirit of God is present in the hearts of the faithful, *by blessing and grace;* and *this is all* which we mean, beside the tropical [*i. e.* metaphorical] and figurative presence."

"By *spiritually* they [Romanists] mean 'present after the manner of a spirit'; by *spiritually* we mean 'present to our spirits only,' that is, so as Christ is not present to any other sense but that of faith, or spiritual susception."

"The wicked receive not Christ, but *the bare symbols only*, but yet to their hurt."

On what is called a *non-local* presence of Christ's Body and Blood in or under the species of bread and wine, Taylor remarks, "*I wish the words were sense*, and that I could tell the meaning of being in a place locally and not locally; . . . but so long as it is a distinction it is no matter; it will amuse and *make a way to escape*, if it will do nothing else."

"*Take eat* and *This do* are as necessary to the Sacrament as *Hoc est corpus meum*, and declare

[*i.e.* make clear] that it is Christ's Body only in the use and administration." "It is Christ's Body only in the taking and eating."

On the phrase "sacramentally present," often used with no definite meaning, Taylor writes, "Christ's Body is sacramentally in more places than one, which is very true, that is, the *sacrament* of Christ's Body is: and so is His Body, *figuratively*, *tropically*, *representatively*, in being, and *really* in effect and blessing."

Such is Taylor's teaching on the Eucharist.[1] No one who is familiar with Taylor can doubt that he was a man of profoundly reverential temperament. But he thought it no part of reverence to shut the eyes of his intelligence at the bidding of those who would palm off upon him unfounded or unmeaning propositions as "mysteries of the faith."[2]

The last work from Bishop Taylor's pen was also on the controversy with Rome. It was undertaken at the united request of his brother prelates in Ireland, and appeared under the title, *A dissuasive from Popery*. This treatise deals in an effective and popular way with most of

[1] It is well to bear this in mind when one peruses the letter printed in Eden's edition of the *Works* (v. 317, *seq.*) on the *Reverence due to the Altar*, which shows how ceremonial observance of a marked kind may be compatible with a belief that many now-a-days would scornfully speak of as "un-catholic."

[2] Coleridge's laudation of Taylor's *Real Presence* will be found in *Notes on English Divines*, i. 280.

the points in dispute between England and Rome.[1]

The overthrow of the Church establishment in the course of the Great Rebellion scattered the clergy. Some were imprisoned; some lived in hiding and wandered from place to place; some, as best they could, continued after their sequestration to minister to the flocks that had been committed to them; some escaped to France or the Low Countries and only returned at the Restoration; some managed somehow to reconcile themselves to submitting to the *de facto* authorities of the day.

Despite the many distractions of those evil times the intellectual activity of our ecclesiastical writers was remarkable. Notable at home were Sanderson, Brian Walton, Hammond, Jeremy Taylor, and one who deserves mention as the first of our Church historians, the wise humourist, Thomas Fuller. Abroad were Bishop Bramhall and Dean John Cosin, afterwards Bishop of Durham.

Cosin (1595—1672) spent some sixteen years of exile, ministering to the English royalists

[1] *The Real Presence* and the *Dissuasive* have been published in the convenient form of a single volume (under the editorship of Dr. Cardwell, Principal of St. Alban's Hall, Oxford), which in its last edition (1852) may be commended to those who do not possess the whole *Works* of Taylor.

who were numerous in Paris, and labouring assiduously to counteract the unceasing efforts of Roman proselytizers. To the necessities of controversy we owe his *Scholastical history of the Canon of the Holy Scripture* (1657), a solid piece of work, and his *Historia Transubstantiationis Papalis*, published posthumously in 1675.

Before the civil war no one had been more vehemently assailed by the Presbyterian party for his alleged Popish tendencies; and he was forced to suffer many indignities on account of his excellent book of *Devotions*. Subsequently none of the clergy suffered from more persistent and rancorous persecution at the hands of the Puritan party. He was in his day one of the most distinguished men of the "High Church" school; but his doctrinal teaching was not what might perhaps be at the present time expected from a "High Churchman." Thus, in his work on Transubstantiation he asserts "the unanimous consent of *all Protestants* with the Church of England" in maintaining "a real, that is a true, presence of Christ in the blessed sacrament."[1] He maintains that Christ did not give His Body "to be received by the mouth," and declares that "reservation" is *impossible* because Christ is "present only to the communicants." But, like every sound Anglican, he forcibly contends that our faith does not *cause* the Presence, but only *apprehends* it.

[1] Chap. II.

Equally surprising to the modern reader, unacquainted with the history of opinion, is this High Churchman's concurrence with Bramhall[1] in a certain recognition of the reformed "sister Churches" abroad. Indeed, Cosin's relations towards the French reformed Church were not only altogether friendly, but even reached, in practice, a measure of intercommunion.[2]

Bramhall (1593—1663), Bishop of Derry, and afterwards Archbishop of Armagh, though not figuring as so prominent an historical personage, has left to our theological literature larger and more valuable bequests. His controversial treatises against Rome were occasioned by the attempts of Romish proselytizers to change the faith of the exiled king. M. de la Milletière and an Englishman named Smith, titular Bishop of Chalcedon, accused the Church of England of "criminal schism" from the one and only true Church of Christ. In a succession of able treatises Bramhall not only repelled the charge, but retorted it with telling effect upon the Church of Rome. Jeremy Taylor prophesied truly when he declared that in the learning, judgment, and piety manifested in these writings, Bramhall's "memory will last unto very late succeeding generations."

[1] *Vindication of Grotius*, p. 614.

[2] See Brewer's *Memoir* (pp. xxviii—xxxii) prefixed to his edition of the *History of Popish Transubstantiation*, and, more particularly, Cosin's Letter to Mr. Cordel.

Bishop Bramhall also deserves notice as being one of the first of our English divines to grapple the false philosophy of unbelief,—more particularly the fatalism taught in effect by Hobbes of Malmesbury. Bramhall, said Taylor, "washed off the ceruse and meretricious paintings" from the "new vizor" with which Hobbes had disguised the ugliness of "the Manichean doctrine of fatal necessity."[1]

Another of the "confessors" under the Puritan persecution was **Henry Hammond** (1605—1660), as good, kind, and generous as he was high-principled, learned, and devout. A charming portrait of this excellent man has been lightly sketched for us, by the pen of Dr. Fell, in one of the best short biographies in the English tongue. But we are concerned here with Hammond as an author.[2] His writings embrace *Annotations* on the whole of the New Testament, on the Psalms, and on a part of the Book of Proverbs, and controversial treatises against Rome, and against the Presbyterians and Independents of England.

[1] *Works*, viii. 417, 418. In Bramhall, says Taylor, "was visible the great lines of Hooker's judiciousness, of Jewel's learning, of the acuteness of Bishop Andrewes."

[2] At an early age Hammond made such extraordinary progress not only in Latin and Greek, but also in Hebrew, that his biographer declares that a knowledge of these tongues "seemed rather infused than acquired." At a later time he added to his attainments a knowledge of Syriac, and this proved helpful to him in his Biblical studies.

The *Annotations* are the work of a true scholar. He was keenly alive to the interest and importance of textual criticism, and had entered on the task of a collation of Greek MSS. of the New Testament. The distractions of the age, and the hardships incurred through his loyalty to the Church and the Crown, prevented his pursuing his labours in this direction; yet his biblical annotations are even in this day, with its multitude of commentaries, seldom consulted without profit. His primary object throughout is, quite in the modern spirit, to get at the literal sense of Scripture. The *Annotations* deserve special notice for Hammond's recognition of the important significance of heresies of a Gnostic character, as bearing on the interpretation of the Epistles. He anticipates the drift of modern thought in seeing the "Antichrist" of the New Testament in Gnosticism rather than in Popery, as many earlier writers of distinction had imagined. And again, as Fell has pointed out, he laboured assiduously at the special study of the "Hellenistic dialect" as distinguished from classical Greek. Here too he tapped a vein of inquiry that has since proved rich in results, and is not yet exhausted.

Of Hammond's controversial writings we can refer only to his defence of Lord Falkland's short but cogent discussion, *Of the infallibility of the Church of Rome* (that "main architectonical controversy," as it is styled by Bishop Pearson,

in his appreciative preface to that excellent work); his book on *Schism* and its defence; his reply to Blondel on the *Ignatian Epistles* (for which he received the thanks of Archbishop Ussher); and his *View of the new Directory and a vindication of the ancient Liturgy of the Church of England.* The last-named discussion has lost but little of its interest, and will be found abounding in useful comments on the Book of Common Prayer.

The work of Hammond which attained greatest popularity was his *Practical Catechism*, meant for the instruction of those who had already been taught the Church Catechism. It was much used, and passed through many editions.[1] Its form is cumbrous, abounding in long questions and elaborate answers; but it is interesting in our day as exhibiting the doctrinal teaching of one of the leading churchmen of the seventeenth century and (as testified to by its wide acceptance) of a very large number of the Anglican clergy. The student who is interested in the Eucharistic controversies of our own time will find much that is instructive in Hammond's discussion of the Sacraments.

Another sufferer for his principles, whose memory will be ever associated with the cause of sacred learning, was **Brian Walton** (1600—1661), consecrated Bishop of Chester at the Restoration. After the sequestration of his

[1] The issue in A. C. L. is said to be the sixteenth.

ecclesiastical preferments he devoted himself in his retirement to the construction and issue of his great *Polyglott*, which, after being five years in printing, appeared in its completed form in 1657, in six large folios. It is an imperishable monument of the learning and unflagging energy of this distinguished scholar, and remains to our own day an essential aid to the study of the biblical texts.[1] This truly valuable contribution to the critical study of the sacred Scriptures did not pass without the censures of some. John Owen, the eminent leader of the Independents, dreaded that the exhibition of so many variations in the text would lead to Popery or infidelity,[2] and Walton felt constrained to furnish a reply. It was a decisive and complete vindication of his work.[3]

In connection with Walton's work the name of **Edmund Castell** (1606—1685) must not be omitted. He was one of the numerous oriental scholars who assisted in the work on the *Polyglott;* but his chief claim for notice is his great *Lexicon Heptaglotton*, upon which he had laboured

[1] Walton's *Prolegomena* to the *Polyglott* have been separately printed, at Leipzig (1777), 8vo, under the editorship of J. A. Dathe, and at Cambridge (1828), 2 vols. 8vo, with additional notes by Archdeacon Wrangham.

[2] *Vindication of the purity and integrity of the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Old and New Testaments, in some considerations on the Prolegomena*, etc., 1658.

[3] *The Considerator considered*, etc., 1659.

for eighteen years.[1] This work has lately been described by a competent authority as marking "an epoch in Semitic scholarship."[2]

Another eminent orientalist associated with Walton was **Edward Pococke** (1604—1691). As early as 1630 he had discovered the Syriac texts of the second Epistle of St. Peter, the second and third of St. John, and St. Jude, and, encouraged by Voss, made them known to the learned world.[3] After a long stay in the East he was made (the first) Arabic Professor, and given a canonry at Oxford. Some time after (1649) he was expelled from his canonry by the authority of Parliament.[4] In later and happier days he published learned commentaries on the prophets, Micah and Malachi (1677), Hosea (1685), and Joel (1691).

But it remains to notice the English Hebraist of widest repute among the learned of the seventeenth century—**John Lightfoot** (1602—1675). Like some other good men brought up under

[1] 2 tom., folio, 1669. The languages included are Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Samaritan Hebrew, Ethiopic Arabic, and Persic. This book ruined the compiler. It cost him more than £12,000, involved him in debt for £1800, and when printed found scarcely any sale. After the Restoration he was made chaplain to the King and Arabic Professor at Cambridge, and given a prebend at Canterbury and some other Church preferment.

[2] Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole.

[3] *Versio et Notæ ad IV. Epistolas, Syriace*, etc., Lugd. Bat. 1630, 4to.

[4] Cromwell's brother-in-law was appointed in his place.

Puritan influences, he had no such conviction of the primary importance of episcopacy as would prevent his accepting the new ecclesiastical *régime*. The worthy Strype (whose painstaking researches into the history of the Reformation period are a rich mine of valuable material), in the introduction to his collection of Lightfoot's *Remains*, attributes his action to his having been deceived by "the smooth and fair pretences" of the Presbyterian party. Strype expresses his conviction that Lightfoot "afterward was convinced how he had been trepanned;" and in proof alleges the fact of his ready compliance with episcopacy as revived at the Restoration. To such conduct doubtless an uglier name than credulity could be given, but we should be grossly ignorant of the time if we did not perceive that there were men of the highest character to whom the question of the form of Church government was very much a matter of indifference. Through the influence of Archbishop Sheldon at the Restoration, Lightfoot was continued in the mastership of Catherine Hall, and also given ecclesiastical preferment. But though he makes ample acknowledgment of the clemency of Charles II. and of the kindness of Sheldon, he makes no confession of guilt. He had served in the Westminster Assembly, and had taken a very independent line upon several occasions.[1]

[1] See his interesting Journal of the proceedings. *Works*, vol. xiii.

On the subject of the lay ruling-elder in the Christian congregations of the early Church, his testimony did not reach the measure that was looked for by his friends of the Presbyterian "platform."[1] His welcoming back the restoration of episcopal government can be well understood without any imputation of unworthy motives. But we are concerned rather with his works than with his character.

Lightfoot's reputation is mainly based on his attempt, largely successful, to illustrate the New Testament from the knowledge of Jewish usages, phraseology, and modes of thought, as they may be gathered from Talmudical literature. This is, without doubt, a vein of inquiry well worth being carefully wrought; yet in some particular instances its value has been much over-estimated. Other labourers abroad have pursued their studies in this direction; but in England little has been done since the publication of Lightfoot's *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ*. His works on *The Temple Service*, and on *The Temple, especially as it stood in the days of our Saviour*, also abound in curious lore drawn from Rabbinical sources.[2]

It was in connection with Semitic studies that **William Beveridge** (1638—1708), afterwards Bishop of St. Asaph's, first attracted notice. At the early age of twenty he published in Latin

[1] See *Works*, iii. p. 243.

[2] *The Harmony of the Four Evangelists* and his topographical studies of Palestine are of less importance.

his treatise on the *Importance and use of the Oriental languages, especially Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic, and Samaritan, together with a Syriac Grammar* (1658). This work was intended for the benefit of those who desired to profit from Walton's labours. But Beveridge's learning extended in other directions. His greatest work, on the Canons of the ancient Church,[1] is characterized by profound learning; and its merits have been recognized abroad as well as at home.[2] Beveridge himself published little in the English tongue; but his *Discourse on the XXXIX. Articles* (which in its full and correct form did not appear till 1840) is an able defence of "the doctrine of the Church of England as consonant to Scripture, reason, and the Fathers." For piety no less than learning, Beveridge is deservedly one of the most honoured names among English theologians.

Among the Semitic scholars who assisted Walton in his great undertaking was **Herbert Thorndike** (†1672), who had been Master of Sidney College, Cambridge. He was versed in Syriac and Arabic as well as in Rabbinical Hebrew, and contributed the various readings of the Syriac to the *Polyglott*. To him we owe a large body of theological treatises. These works made little impression at the time; but

[1] *Synodicon, sive Pandectæ Canonum SS. Apostolorum et Conciliorum*, etc., 1672, 2 tom. folio.

[2] As, *e.g.*, by Van Espen.

they have been reprinted in the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, with an admirable biography by Mr. A. W. Haddan. In most of his writings Thorndike exhibits a desire to reconcile, as far as might be, the contrariant doctrines of Rome and England; and among divines of repute he (like Montagu at an earlier time) touches the high-water mark of the conciliatory movement. Indeed, if we trust Bishop Barlow, the wise Sanderson had Thorndike in his mind's eye when he wrote of some "children of the Church" who had "over-run their Mother," had used "her name without her leave," and had thus "causelessly brought an evil suspicion upon her." His mature judgment on various questions in dispute may be most safely sought for in a work published only just before his death, *The Reformation of the Church of England better than that of the Council of Trent.* Thorndike indulges in theological *speculation* to an extent not ventured on by our more sober divines. A peculiar interest attaches to him as being, I think, the first to ventilate views on the Eucharist which with little modification afterwards took definite shape in the theories of the non-jurors. To appreciate his position in some of his earlier writings we must remember that "the tragedy of the Church of England," and its extinction as a Church establishment, seemed to him to allow his suggesting a more comprehensive doctrinal basis for its

possible reconstruction hereafter. In judging of the *Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England*, Mr. Haddan has justly observed—"It is one thing to pull a house to pieces which is standing uninjured, in order to remedy unessential defects; another to suggest improvements in rebuilding of a house at the time in ruins." Thorndike is defective in the arrangement and presentation of his thoughts, and his style is laboured and difficult. Nevertheless the patient and painstaking reader will find much to repay his labour in the study of his learned and thoughtful discussion of many weighty problems.

As in the case of Beveridge, it was at an early age that **Edward Stillingfleet** (1635—1699), afterwards Bishop of Worcester (1689), published the first of a long series of able works. His *Irenicum, or Weapon-Salve for the Church's Wounds*, appeared in 1659. The time was the critical moment when hopes ran high that the Church of England might when restored be adapted to embrace the many more moderate Presbyterian divines who were not unwilling to accept an episcopal form of government, if "lordly prelacy" were so modified as to allow the second order of the ministry a larger voice in the management of ecclesiastical affairs. Young Stillingfleet, writing with a desire to effect a peace, takes up the position of our earlier theologians, that no particular form of

Church government was expressly commanded in Holy Scripture, or could be established on the grounds of natural reason. The arguments in favour of this opinion occupy the main part of the volume, and he concludes by suggesting, as a return to primitive practice—(1) that presbyters should act as "the senate to the bishop"; (2) that dioceses should not be larger than would permit of the personal inspection of the bishop, and that a bishop should be placed in every great town; (3) that a provincial synod should be held twice each year; and (4) that "none should judge in Church matters but the clergy." Whatever may be thought of the arguments as to the form of Church government being "a mere matter of *prudence*, regulated by the Word of God," some of the practical suggestions of Stillingfleet have commended themselves in our own time to the independent Churches of the Anglican Communion, while the great increase of the episcopate in England shows that he had anticipated in spirit the need of the reduction in the size of dioceses.

The *Irenicum* was certainly a remarkable work for so young a man. Warburton compares it with Taylor's *Liberty of Prophesying*, and regards it as a masterly plea for toleration. It is more properly a masterly plea for such reforms in the Church as would give less show of justification for the complaints of Protestant dissent. There is nothing inconsistent in this

early work with his later treatise, *The Unreasonableness of Separation from the Church of England* (1681).

Stillingfleet's *Origines sacræ, or a rational account of the grounds of Christian faith as to the truth and Divine authority of the Scriptures and the matters therein contained* (1662), reached a third edition by 1666, and has been again and again reprinted. Modern inquiries into the origin of the Pentateuch leave no doubt of the inadequacy of this work to meet the difficulties of our time. But its learning and ability cannot be reasonably questioned. "Let any competent person," says one of the acutest critics of our time,[1] "read the chapters on Ancient History in the first Book of the *Origines*, and the account of the laws against the Christians in Book II., c. 9, and he will see that those who sneer at that great work are themselves the proper objects of pity or contempt."

The anti-Roman treatises of Stillingfleet, his *Origines Britannicæ, or the antiquities of the British Churches*,[2] and his unfortunate controversy with Locke, must, with regret, be here passed over in silence.

[1] Bishop Fitzgerald in *Aids to Faith*, p. 45.

[2] The best edition is Mr. Pantin's (Oxford, 1842), to which is added Bishop W. Lloyd's *Historical account of Church Government as first received in Great Britain and Ireland.*

LECTURE V

Moral theology in the seventeenth century—The English casuists: Perkins, Ames, Sanderson, Hall, Taylor—Joseph Mead—Hales of Eton—The Cambridge Platonists: Whichcote, Smith, Cudworth, More—Bishop Pearson—Barrow—Bishop Bull—The anti-Roman pamphleteers.

In continuing the review of the more eminent divines of the seventeenth century our attention may be transferred for a time from works concerned with doctrinal controversies, or biblical learning, to certain important studies in a special field of inquiry where the English Church has been in general gravely deficient—I mean moral theology.

The word "casuistry," as generally used, carries with it an evil connotation. It suggests notions of deceit and trickery. Men have come to think of it as the studied art not of *ascertaining*, but of *evading* duty. Yet it is obvious that in the course of daily life complex cases are constantly occurring where duty is not clear, or where (apparently) two or more duties seem to conflict with one another. Hence, call it by

what name we will, there arises the necessity of dealing with such cases. To be one's own casuist is not always the course of discretion; and a good and sensible man will often with advantage ask the aid of one who is well-informed, wise, and practised in the exercise of moral discrimination. Cases, for instance, are frequently arising out of the relations of human law to conscience, and out of the numerous questions that concern the obligations to truth, as between man and man, where duty is by no means obvious. The regular practice of habitual confession (as in the Roman Church) has, of course, strongly stimulated casuistical studies;[1] but, even where the practice is not general, a faithful pastor will be frequently consulted in cases of difficulty; and experience shows that the rough-and-ready answer of our first thoughts is by no means to be always trusted.

It is worthy of notice that it was among divines of the Puritan school that casuistry was first studied with any care in the reformed Church. **William Perkins** (1558—1602), who had been a Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, and attained a considerable repute as a preacher and commentator, gave special atten-

[1] Jeremy Taylor observes, "The careless and needless neglect of receiving private confessions hath been too great a cause of our not providing materials apt for so pious and useful a ministration."—*Ductor Dubitantium*, Preface.

tion to this subject.[1] He was followed by another and more distinguished Cambridge student, **William Ames** (1576—1633), who had studied under Perkins, and came afterwards to be Professor of Divinity at Franeker, in Friesland. His volume, *De conscientia et ejus jure, vel casibus* (1630), deals with many problems, some of the inner and spiritual life, some of practical conduct. The solutions of the cases are sometimes affected by the peculiarities of Puritan theology; and not infrequently a Puritan bias is discernible; yet on the whole the works of both Perkins and Ames are marked by good sense and sound reasoning. Ames points to the serious lack of the discussion of cases of conscience by Protestant divines. To him is due the happy metaphor (which, by the way, the conscience of our eminent casuist, Jeremy Taylor, permitted him to *borrow* without acknowledgment) that through this deficiency of sound teaching among ourselves the children of Israel were compelled to go down to the Philistines (*id est, nostri studiosi ad Pontificios authores*) to sharpen, every man, his share, his coulter, his axe, and his mattock.[2]

Robert Sanderson (1587–1662), Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford (1642), and after the Restor-

[1] *The Whole Treatise of the Cases of Conscience* was a posthumous work, appearing in 1606; reprinted separately 1614, and in Perkins' collected *Works*.

[2] *Præfatio ad lectorem.*

ation Bishop of Lincoln (1660—1662),[1] stands out above the earlier writers by the reason of the thoroughness of his examination of fundamental principles, as well as by his superior intellectual acumen. The seven Lectures (1646) delivered at Oxford, *De juramenti promissorii obligatione* (suggested by the parliamentary imposition of the Solemn League and Covenant), and the ten lectures (1647), *De obligatione conscientiæ*, are works of solid and permanent value, and abound (especially the latter) in applications pertinent to many questions of our own time. In thoroughness, accuracy, and soundness of judgment, Sanderson seems to me to far surpass his more brilliant contemporary, the author of the *Ductor Dubitantium*. In these lectures Sanderson, who had as early as 1615 published a work on Logic,[2] which long held its place as the manual in use at Oxford till it was at length superseded by Aldrich, employs habitually and familiarly terms of the Aristotelian philosophy now little used and imperfectly understood; but, as Dr. Whewell has justly observed, "in his hands these technicalities become really instruments of an effective and methodical discussion of his subject."[3] "It would be difficult,"

[1] It is to Sanderson's pen we owe the *Preface* of our present English *Book of Common Prayer*; and an admirable piece of work it is.

[2] *Logicæ Artis Compendium.*

[3] Preface to Whewell's edition of *De Oblig. Consc.*, 1851.

writes the same authority, "to discuss most of the moral questions which form the latter part of the work in a more satisfactory manner than is there done." Not only as an intellectual exercise, but as furnishing him with principles constantly applicable to one of the most important duties of a physician of souls, Sanderson's work on *Conscience* may be strongly commended to every student preparing for the ministry of the Church.[1]

There have been happily preserved to us a few examples of cases of conscience on which Sanderson was specially consulted, together with his answers. They are well worth studying as instances of sagacity and sound judgment.[2]

Sanderson, as a preacher, showed his marked predilection for the discussion of ethical questions of daily interest. His sermons, cleared of the mannerism of the period and the (more than usually frequent) antique forms of phraseology and structure, supply a rich treasury to the modern preacher. King Charles I. numbered Sanderson among his favourite chaplains;

[1] The late Bishop of Lincoln (Christopher Wordsworth) required a knowledge of this work from candidates for Holy Orders. It is to be regretted that the old translation by Lewis (1722) was employed by the Bishop as the basis of the English edition published (1877) by him; for though some corrections have been made, the rendering is still in many places faulty.

[2] See vol. v. of Jacobson's admirable edition of Sanderson's *Works*.

and his saying, reported by Izaak Walton, "I take my ears to other preachers, but I take my conscience to Mr. Sanderson," aptly marks the distinguishing characteristic of this great divine.

"Of all Divinity," wrote **Hall**, Bishop of Norwich, "that part is most useful which determines cases of conscience." From his pen we have a small body of *Resolutions and Decisions of divers practical cases of conscience, in continual use among men.* The cases are forty in number, some connected with questions arising in trade and commerce, some arising out of that fertile source of doubts, the marriage laws, etc.; all are in the true sense practical, and are dealt with in a thoroughly practical manner, with competent learning and admirable good sense. "I could be easily more voluminous," wrote Hall, "though perhaps not more satisfactory." It could be wished that the writer next to be noticed had been actuated by a like spirit.

Jeremy Taylor's *Ductor Dubitantium*, begun in earlier years, was completed in his forced retirement at Portmore on the beautiful shores of Lough Neagh, and was published in 1660. It is divided into four books, dealing respectively with (I.) Conscience in general; (II.) Divine Laws; (III.) Human Laws; and (IV.) The nature and causes of good and evil. In the course of the work a large number of "cases" are treated and resolved. Like everything from

his pen, it exhibits copious, perhaps over-copious reading, not always pertinent, and a fertile and even luxuriant fancy. But it often lacks that precision of thought which the subject demands. It is tedious and verbose, and is more serviceable in illustrating our conclusions than in helping us to reach them. Many of its pages will entertain the curious reader with a vast variety of citations drawn from all quarters, the Greek and Latin classics, the Fathers, the Schoolmen, the Canonists, the Civilians, and the later Humanists. Those whose literary taste is formed on Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* will enjoy many parts of the *Ductor Dubitantium;* and Taylor, moreover, possesses an imaginative energy of his own which is lacking in "Democritus Junior." But one who seeks the solution of some moral problem is tempted to become impatient under this unprofitable and often impertinent display of reading. To what is properly the science of ethics Taylor contributes little or nothing that is of value in his long discussions on the nature of conscience; but despite his wearisome prolixity, and his occasional subservience to human authorities, his large-minded practical judgment generally serves him in good stead when he deals with the resolution of "cases." We are bound, however, to say that frequently his *decision* is more sound than the *reasons* which he alleges in its support.

Few questions reveal the general tone of a

casuist better than those which relate to *truth* and its obligations. In the cases proposed, Taylor is not betrayed into the follies of extravagant rigorism, and yet maintains a high standard of duty. Occasionally he appears not to know his own way clearly out of the labyrinth which his fertile intellect has constructed. But we may reject as wholly baseless the imputation of Hallam,[1] that on the subject of "a probable conscience" he approaches "the decried theories of the Jesuits." On the contrary, the vicious doctrine of "probabilism" is distinctly condemned and repudiated.[2]

Taken as a whole, this work, upon which Taylor laboured longest, brilliant as it is in many parts, is not the outcome of a precise and accurate mind, and as a contribution to moral theology its value is slight.[3]

From the course of the main stream of Anglican divinity moral theology must be counted only as a little bay or by-water, where, notwithstanding its attractions, we cannot afford time to linger. We again push out into the central current.

The works upon which chiefly rests the repu-

[1] *Literature of Europe*, iv. p. 154.

[2] *Duct. Dubit.*, Book i. chap. 4.

[3] It was Taylor's experiences in hearing confessions that first suggested the *Ductor Dubitantium*. The excellent John Evelyn was one to whom he acted as "spiritual father."

tation of **Joseph Mead**[1] (1586—1638), the recluse of Christ's College, Cambridge, are his *Clavis Apocalyptica*, and kindred studies on the Revelation of St. John and the prophet Daniel. On the merits or demerits of his treatment of these difficult subjects I am quite incompetent to offer an opinion. It must suffice to say that with most of those who have made prophecy a subject of study, the esteem in which Mead is held seems rather to have increased than diminished in the course of time. But there are other writings of his which have made a distinct impression on theological opinion. Of these we may particularly refer to his work on *The Christian Sacrifice* (1635). This brief treatise, scholarly and candid, admirably arranged and lucidly written, deserves the careful study of every one interested in the eucharistic controversies of our own time. The kindred tract, *On the name Altar or* Θυσιαστήριον *anciently given to the Holy Table*, was written before the acrimonious controversy on the subject had broken out, and forms an interesting contribution to the study of Christian antiquities.[2] The distinctive feature of Mead's treatise is his display of the proofs that the ancient Church offered the bread and wine, first "to agnize" (*i. e.* acknowledge) God "the Lord of the creature,"

[1] So he himself spelled his name, though it is more commonly written "Mede."

[2] Some small corrections are made by Bingham (*Antiquities*, Book VIII. chap. vi. § 12).

the Giver of the gifts ; and, secondly, as symbols of the broken Body and shed Blood of Christ, "to represent and inculcate His blessed passion to His Father."[1] He guards himself from misapprehension by insisting at length on the teaching that this latter sacrifice "was placed *in commemoration only ;*" or, as he otherwise puts it, "the Christian sacrifice is an oblation of thanksgiving and prayer, through Jesus Christ, commemorated in the creatures of bread and wine." This commemoration is before God the Father, "and is not a bare remembrance or putting ourselves in mind only (as is commonly supposed), but a putting of God in mind."

It is worth observing that some two years after Mead had given expression to these views, the Scottish Prayer-book (1637), as revised by Laud, inserted the rubric in the Communion Office—"The Presbyter shall then *offer up* and place the bread and wine prepared for the Sacrament upon the Lord's Table ;" and thus was recognized the first oblation of the elements in accordance with primitive usage. And so the rubric stands at this day in the commonly received text of the characteristic Liturgy of the Scottish Episcopal Church. At the time of the revision of the English Prayer-book in 1661 an unsuccessful attempt was made to introduce a

[1] Field (*Of the Church*, appendix to Book III.) had indicated the same line of thought.

similar rubric.[1] It was probably an unreasoning dread of anything which looked like an approach to Rome that prevented any general acceptance at the time of Mead's teaching; but so far as concerns the making the memorial of the Sacrifice of Calvary before the Father, it reappears at a later date in the writings of Archbishop Bramhall, of Bishop Patrick, of Thorndike, of Bishop Bull, and of all of the non-juring school.[2]

A few years later than the publication of Mead's work on *The Christian Sacrifice*, another Cambridge man, **Ralph Cudworth** (1617—1688), published his *True Notion of the Lord's Supper* (1642), where the design of the author is to show that the Eucharist "is not a sacrifice, but a feast upon a sacrifice . . . not the offering up of something to God upon an altar, but the eating of something that comes from God's altar, and is set upon our tables."[3] This was Cudworth's first essay in literary work, and was published when he was only twenty-five years of age. Except for its early indication of extensive reading, it

[1] The Prayer-book of the American Church in this follows the English Prayer-book.

[2] Mead's *Discourses*, preached in his College Chapel, contain many careful studies of the sense of difficult passages of Scripture, and well deserve, together with his work on *The Christian Sacrifice*, to be reprinted.

[3] Waterland, in his *Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist* (chap. xi.), discusses the objections made to Cudworth.

gave little promise of the powers exhibited in his great work, the *Intellectual System of the Universe*. Its radical defect is the total incompetence of his theory to account for the language of even the very earliest writers of primitive Christian antiquity. Here Mead's superiority is quite overwhelming.

It has been stated (and there is nothing improbable in the statement) that while Chillingworth was engaged on his *Religion of Protestants*, he had asked for the views of a friend, who, though then unknown by his writings, had a considerable reputation in a learned and cultivated circle. This was "the ever-memorable **Mr. John Hales** of Eton College."[1] Hales (1584—1656) was a man of refined and sensitive nature, an exquisite scholar, and marked by a very wide and varied culture, "as great a master"—to use the words of Bishop Pearson—"of polite, various, and universal learning as ever yet conversed with books." He shrank from controversy, and lived, as far as might be, in retirement, occasionally diversified by the society of poets, wits, and courtiers, rather than of ecclesiastics. His influence during his life-time was due to his familiar conversation in the circle of his cultivated associates. He had an obstinate dislike to allowing anything of his to be published; and almost everything of his that we now possess

[1] So styled on the title-page of the *Golden Remains*.

we owe to the care with which friends cherished his writings.

In his early years Hales had been present, though only as a curious spectator, at the Synod of Dort, and it was there probably he acquired the strong repugnance to ecclesiastical bigotry and intolerance which was afterwards a settled feature of his character. At Dort, as he himself expressed it, he "bid John Calvin good-night"; and it is plain he bid good-night not only to Calvin and the Dutch Calvinism of the Five Articles, but also to the narrow and persecuting spirit that would restrict the communion of Christ's Church to those who symbolized with the triumphant party. It may be that afterwards his comprehensiveness ran too far in the direction of laxity. But, at any rate, the drift of his thought and feeling was quite in accord with the spirit of Chillingworth's treatise. And in Hales we find the germ of Taylor's *Liberty of Prophesying*.

If we may accept the story, his little paper, *Concerning Schism and Schismatics* (not printed till 1642), was prepared for the use of Chillingworth (about 1636), and, having been handed about in manuscript, made no small stir. In the tract itself it must have been rather what was suggested than what was asserted, which gave offence. One can hardly read it without feeling that the author had in his mind's eye the hard rigour with which Archbishop Laud (who

was tolerant to doctrinal variations) had been pressing ceremonial uniformity. "If the special guides and fathers of the Church," says Hales, "would be a little sparing of encumbering churches with superfluities, or not over-rigid either in reviving of obsolete customs, or imposing new, there would be far less cause of schism or superstition; and all the inconvenience were likely to ensue would be but this, they should in so doing yield a little to the imbecility[1] of their inferiors, a thing which St. Paul would never have refused to do." And in the matter of belief he boldly refutes the notion "that men of different opinions in Christian religion may not hold communion *in sacris*." He urges that "*opinionum varietas et opinantium unitas*" are not incompatible. All of which, to be sure, is quite true; but the practical question as to the permissible *extent* of doctrinal variety he does not seriously attempt to grapple. Elsewhere he is frequent in insisting on the view that errors in doctrine are more pardonable than any falling short of the high standard of the Christian character. The presentation of this side of truth was indeed much needed in his day, and perhaps in our own day it is not without its value. In a spirit that reminds us of Justin Martyr and more than one early writer of the

[1] The word is obviously used with a reference to Rom. xv. 1, where we find in the Vulgate *imbecillitates infirmorum*.

Alexandrian school, he exclaims, "The man of virtuous dispositions, though ignorant of the mystery of Christ, be it Fabricius, or Regulus, or any ancient heathen man, famous for sincerity and uprightness of carriage, hath as sure a claim and interest in the Church of Christ, as the man deepest skilled in, most certainly believing, and openly professing all that is written in the holy Books of God, if he endeavour not to show his faith by his works."[1] The large and generous current of Hales' human sympathy, and his appreciation of all that is good wherever it is to be found,are characteristic features of his writings, and make him one of the most delightful, stimulating, and wholesome of the divines of the seventeenth century. He appears as quite unconnected historically with the School of Cambridge divines who came, at a later time, to be spoken of as the "Latitude-men," though his tone is in many respects similar to theirs.

The shameful controversial *animus* that imputed Socinian views to Hales had not a shadow of justification. His *Confession of the Trinity* has been happily preserved,[2] and sets at rest the question, which in truth should never have been raised. And the warm eulogy of the great champion of orthodoxy, Bishop Pearson, prefixed to the *Golden Remains*, and unqualified by the

[1] Sermon, "Of dealing with erring Christians," in *Golden Remains* (edit. 1673), p. 37.

[2] *Golden Remains*, p. 257.

slightest hint at censure, may satisfy any as to the soundness of Hales, while it is entirely creditable to the large-hearted and generous spirit of Pearson himself. Pearson had known Hales personally, and it is quite remarkable how the somewhat cold and judicial temper of the critic warms as he recalls his own "long experience and intimate acquaintance" of Hales. "He really was," he declares, "a most prodigious example of an acute and piercing wit, of a vast and illimited knowledge, of a severe and profound judgment," and his genuine goodness, Pearson goes on to say, was even more wonderful than his "intellectual perfections."

As we approach the period of the Restoration there comes into some prominence a little group of Cambridge men associated together in earlier days by college ties, and, as time went on, by a prevailing community of view in their way of regarding religious questions. They came to be known as the "Latitude-men," and sometimes as the "Cambridge Platonists." The most eminent among them were **Benjamin Whichcote** (1610—1683), **John Smith** (1618—1652), **Ralph Cudworth** (1617—1688), and **Henry More** (1614—1687).

To explain satisfactorily the origin of this coterie, or "set," as we should now style it, would demand a minute knowledge of the history of life and thought in the Cambridge colleges during the reign of Charles I., to which I cannot

pretend.[1] The leading figures of this little band, Whichcote, Smith, and Cudworth, were all members of Emmanuel College, the Puritan foundation of Sir Walter Mildmay; and the influences by which they had been surrounded were certainly not of a kind to attach them to the royalist and Church party. We find some of them at a later period accepting offices and emoluments in the University from which the royalist divines had been expelled under the usurpation. It is quite impossible to believe they had any real sympathy with the dogmatic system of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. We are scarcely in a position to judge their conduct or pronounce on the moral problems which they were compelled to solve in practice. It is satisfactory to know that Whichcote, when advanced to the Provostship of King's College, not only refused to subscribe the Solemn League and Covenant, but was sufficiently influential to protect from such an intolerable test all the Fellows of that foundation.

It is not difficult to imagine how during the miserable distractions, civil and religious, which then embittered English life, thoughtful and quiet-loving men would seek to avoid the contentious questions of theology, and turn their attention to the great fundamental truths that

[1] Mr. J. B. Mullinger's interesting essay, *Cambridge Characteristics in the Seventeenth Century* (1867), may be consulted.

lie at the basis of all religion, and to the moral and spiritual aspects of Christianity. On questions of Church government it is likely enough that they were really indifferent. Henry More puts the matter with considerable force when he says, "If the external form of Church government were of such mighty consequence as that *this* ought to be called antichristian, *that* reputed *jure divino*, and that it were essential to a true Church to have such or such a kind of government rather than another, Christ would have left more express command and direction concerning it." And on the dogmas of Calvinistic theology the Cambridge men were content in general not actively to debate them, but by their positive teaching partly to divert attention from them, and partly to silently undermine them. It is a real and serious defect that the corporate character of the Church was imperfectly realized, and that the sacramental system of the Church had little significance for them.

They shrank from acrimonious controversy. They sought to escape from the clouds and storms of our lower airs by living on elevated heights and in the somewhat rarefied atmosphere of philosophical speculation. But both with Whichcote and with Smith a deep religious veneration for conscience, as the immediate voice of God, was a constant check to any tendency to unprofitable vagueness. With them, if with any men, religion was "a practical thing."

To speak of the best of these writers as "mystics" is very likely to mislead. They dwelt much, it is true, on the personal relations of the soul to God. But nothing can be more intellectually severe than their resolve to guard against the self-deceptions that come under the guise of immediate revelations.

"*Intra te, quære Deum*, seek for God within thine own soul." "To seek our divinity merely in books and writings is to seek the living among the dead: we do but in vain seek God many times in these, where His truth too often is not so much enshrined but entombed." "The soul itself hath its sense as well as the body: and therefore David, when he would teach us how to know what the divine goodness is, calls not for speculation but sensation—*Taste and see* how good the Lord is." "There is an inward beauty, life, and loveliness in Divine Truth which cannot be known but only when it is *digested into life and practice*." These words from Smith, greater in every sense than his master Whichcote, will, better than any attempt of mine, put us at the centre of the spirit of the Cambridge school.

On the intellectual side, as it is not difficult to understand, the Cambridge Platonists were engaged largely in the statement and defence of the primary truths of natural religion. Thus it was with Whichcote; and in the few *Select Discourses* of John Smith that have come down to us we have treatises on "Atheism," "the

existence and nature of God," "the immortality of the soul," and "superstition" in the sense of "an over-timorous apprehension of the Deity." Again on "Atheism" and "the immortality of the soul" we have from Henry More two elaborate works; while the greatest product of the Cambridge school, viewed from the side of thought and power of philosophical speculation, Cudworth's unfinished *Intellectual System of the Universe*, is directed almost wholly against the atheistic and fatalistic tendency of the writings of Hobbes. It is a work marked by profuse erudition and, what was rarer among English divines, by great philosophical insight.

While in his day More was much more generally esteemed, and secured a large sale for his works, the reputation of Cudworth has grown with years; and both the *Intellectual System* and his little posthumous work on *Eternal and Immutable Morality* will always have a respected place in the esteem of philosophical theologians.

It was with such deep fundamental and primary principles of religion, rather than with any parts of developed systems of distinctively Christian dogma, that the Cambridge school were mainly occupied.[1]

[1] The name "Latitude-men," or "Latitudinarians," points to the line of large tolerance as to varieties in belief, which, notably, these Cambridge men advocated, though, as we have seen, a like spirit was manifested by

If in a company of well-informed persons the question were asked, "Who were the three greatest among the masters of theology in the Church of England?" the answers made might probably vary either as to the selected names, or as to the order in which they were placed; but it would be strange indeed if any of the replies did not include among the three the name of Bishop Pearson. And, beyond all doubt, **John Pearson** (1612—1686) possessed in a high degree a rare combination of great natural gifts, trained and disciplined, with great attainments in learning. In him we find erudition, not only wide but minutely exact, and a critical faculty keen and penetrating. In him we find sound reasoning which never builds, as in the case of some who have great reputations, a huge superstructure of top-heavy inference upon an insufficient or rickety base. In him we find a judicial capacity that seems never

---

others of the more "churchly" school; while the term "Platonists" seems to have been attached to them on account of the prominence given by some of them to the teaching of Platonism, more particularly as it took shape in the writings of the later or Neo-Platonic school, represented by Plotinus and Proclus. Dr. Tulloch in his *Rational Theology*, etc. (vol. ii.) deals at length with the Cambridge Platonists, and gives some account not only of the leaders but of the minor members of the school, as Culverwel, Worthington, and others. An interesting lecture on Benjamin Whichcote by Bishop Westcott will be found in *Masters in English Theology* (pp. 147—173).

swayed by prepossessions, that looks at the evidence, all the evidence, and only the evidence, before pronouncing judgment.

Pearson has left us not more than two works of any considerable length; but each of these is in its way a masterpiece,—the *Exposition of the Creed* (1659)[1] and the *Vindiciæ Epistolarum S. Ignatii* (1672).

Pearson, like so many of the clergy of royalist sympathies, had been deprived of his parochial charge; yet, unwilling to be idle in his Master's work, he accepted the invitation of the parishioners of St. Clement's, Eastcheap, in London, to deliver to them a weekly lecture. These lectures, on the Apostles' Creed, his hearers requested him to publish; and this he did, after recasting them in the form that we now possess in the *Exposition*.

The plan of this great work is to give in the text an exposition of each article of the Creed, supporting it "upon the written Word of God," and avoiding with rigid strictness "inserting the least sentence or phrase of any learned language." To this determination, systematically carried out, the book owes much of its success. It deals with a complete and definite circle of truth, the essentials of Christianity; and the result is a self-contained treatise, sufficient for its purpose, and

[1] The third folio edition of 1669 was apparently the last that was revised by the author, and it is taken as the basis of our best edition, that of Rev. T. Chevallier, as revised by Rev. R. Sinker, Cambridge, 1882.

available to every intelligent person of ordinary education. The solidity of Pearson's reasoning, and his studied care to keep clear of "doubtful disputations," carries the student on from step to step with few occasions for hesitating and demurring. To those who acknowledge the authority of Holy Scripture (for that is assumed) *Pearson on the Creed* is a book that nearly everywhere carries conviction.

Again, when we turn to the copious notes we have a great store-house of erudite illustration, drawn from all quarters, admirably arranged, and distinguished from too many displays of learning in being thoroughly pertinent. In this as in all his works the most cursory remarks, the merest *obiter dicta* are precious. As was said of Pearson by one who was himself competent to judge—Richard Bentley—"the very dust of his writings is gold." I would add that even the silence of Pearson, where some would expect him to speak, is often highly suggestive.

In his constant reference to Christian antiquity as a guide to the interpretation of Scripture Pearson is a typical Anglican theologian. In his epistle dedicatory to the parishioners of St. Clement's he puts his position briefly—"In Christianity . . . whatsoever is truly new is certainly false." And the same principle is expressed in his Latin Sermon, preached at Cambridge *ad clerum*, on the text, "Stand ye in the ways and see and ask for the old paths" (Jer. vi. 16), where

the preacher cried aloud, "Shun novelty, inquire what was from the beginning, consult the sources, go to antiquity, go back to the Fathers, look to the Primitive Church." Here he declares is the defence against Rome. Here is the defence against Puritanism.

The English style of Pearson is not one of his strong points. His sentences are often long and laboured, and are sometimes disfigured by awkward constructions.[1] Still the attentive reader will seldom miss the sense. The *Exposition* is indeed a great possession of the English Church. The late Bishop of Brechin (A. P. Forbes) used to say, "The man who has mastered his *Pearson on the Creed* may be reckoned a considerable theologian."

Comparatively few are capable of truly estimating the value of the second work of Pearson which we have named; but it is in truth perhaps an even greater effort of his extraordinary powers. The *Vindiciæ Epistolarum S. Ignatii*[2] was an answer to Daillé's attempt to show that the letters attributed to Ignatius were really productions long posterior to his time. "It was," writes Bishop Lightfoot, "incomparably the most valuable contribution to the subject which had hitherto ap-

[1] The frequent construction commencing with "being that" (though not peculiar to Pearson) is extremely rare in our good writers, and is now entirely obsolete.

[2] Editions in 1672, 1698, 1724, and in A.C.L., edited by Archdeacon Churton, 2 vols. 1852.

peared, with the single exception of Ussher's work. Pearson's learning, critical ability, clearness of statement, and moderation of tone, nowhere appear to greater advantage than in this work. If here and there an argument is overstrained, this was the almost inevitable consequence of the writer's position as the champion of a cause which had been recklessly and violently assailed on all sides. . . . Compared with Daillé's attack, Pearson's reply was as light to darkness. In England at all events his work seemed to be accepted as closing the controversy." [1]

It is impossible here to notice the minor works of Pearson, though all of them are of interest, and some are of considerable importance,[2] and we will conclude our brief account with the words of a contemporary, by no means always friendly to divines of the school which Pearson represents, Bishop Burnet—Pearson "was in all respects the greatest divine of the age : a man of great learning, strong reason, and of a clear judgment." [3]

The great and varied powers of **Isaac Barrow** (1630—1677), mathematician, scholar, and theologian, conjoined with his sound and masculine judgment, made him a notable figure among the

[1] *Apostolic Fathers*, Part II. vol. i. p. 320.

[2] The *Minor Theological Works* have been collected and edited by Archdeacon Churton. Oxford, 1844, 2 vols.

[3] *Own Times*, iii. 142. See also an excellent criticism by Archdeacon Cheetham in *Masters in English Theology*.

many eminent men that distinguished the reign of Charles II.

Barrow's abilities showed themselves early. He was about nineteen years of age when he became a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. He was then for a time an eager student of the experimental and natural sciences, chemistry, anatomy, and botany, then beginning to gain a footing at that University. Some five years later he would have succeeded to the Professorship of Greek but for the forcible abduction, as the story goes, of one of the electors favourable to his claims. The next year (1655) he set out upon his journeyings on the Continent and in the Levant. He was qualified to profit by foreign travel. His mind was already well stored; and both the present and the past were to him full of interest. At Paris he inquires into the condition of the French Protestants; and turning to the ancient seats of learning he laments that there were no successors to the power or erudition of Gassendi or Mersenne, of Petavius or Sirmond. The Sorbonne he contrasts very unfavourably with his own College. At Florence the treasures of the library and the museum engross him. In Turkey he made a study of Mohammedanism which afterwards bore fruit.[1] At Constantinople he read the works of its greatest prelate, St. Chrysostom, his favourite among the Fathers.

[1] In his treatise *Epitome Fidei et Religionis Turcicæ*.

After some four years abroad, returning by Germany and Holland, he reached England, and immediately obtained ordination from Brownrigg, the deprived Bishop of Exeter.

At the Restoration the Professorship of Greek at Cambridge fell to his lot, and not long afterwards, as an acknowledged master in a totally different line, he was appointed, first, Professor of Geometry in Gresham College, in London, and two years later Lucasian Professor at Cambridge. Those who are competent to judge assign to Barrow a high place among English mathematicians, some, indeed, a place second only to his illustrious pupil, Isaac Newton. Such was the man who now turned to devote his whole powers to the study of theology. Barrow's best known work is his *Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy*. It had not received his final handling and adjustment when the author's life was brought to an untimely close in his forty-seventh year. But even as it is, it is a masterly and exhaustive discussion, and in its main contention has never been refuted, nor indeed, as we think, is capable of refutation so long as history is history. Later writers have only added further proofs and illustrations to his solid and convincing argument.

On Pearson's elevation to the bishopric of Chester (1672) Barrow succeeded him as head of Trinity College, Cambridge. It is interesting to note that the two most able and scholarly

treatises on the Creed, in the English tongue, should have come from the pens of two successive Masters of Trinity. As distinguished from Pearson's work, Barrow's "Sermons on the Creed," as has been justly remarked,[1] dwell "on the vital and operative, rather than on the formal and scientific side of our faith." And we may add that while Pearson is more minute, and precise in the treatment of details, Barrow's lines are drawn with a bolder hand and have a larger sweep. His mind is more philosophic in its bent, and he is more alive to the movements of thought and speculation in his own time. His arguments are elucidated by a more varied range of illustration, and are from time to time suffused by a glow of genuine emotion. His robust and practical judgment puts on one side many of the scholastic subtleties that occupied Pearson, and he sets himself to grapple with the main and central forces of unbelief.[2] Pearson's work is better suited for the technical theologian; Barrow's appeals to the theologian, but also to a wider circle of thoughtful men interested in religion.

Barrow's elaborate and exhaustive sermons are mainly concerned with questions of life and morals; and when he deals with dogma, it is

[1] Dr. Wace in *Classic Preachers of the Church of England* (first series), p. 48.

[2] This is well illustrated by the different treatment of the first Article of the Creed.

almost always because of its direct bearing on conduct. An illustration of this remark will be found in his four great sermons on *The Doctrine of Universal Redemption.*

Barrow's temper of mind, at once truly reverent and yet averse from all obscurantism, is exhibited very clearly in his short treatise on *The Doctrine of the Sacraments.* The questions about which there have been endless wranglings are brushed aside, or, more correctly, are simply disregarded, and the whole energy of the author's powerful understanding is directed to the interpretation of the sense of Holy Scripture.

George Bull (1634—1710) had been ordained in the days of the Commonwealth by Dr. Skinner, the deprived Bishop of Oxford.[1] He was in his seventy-first year when he was elevated to the bishopric of St. David's. In the parish in which he ministered in his early days, he found that much antinomian teaching was current, and he set himself to study the question of Good Works and their relation to Justification. From an unwillingness to add to the rancour of popular discussion upon this subject he resolved to submit his views to the limited circle of the learned in the Latin tongue; and in 1670 he published his *Harmonia Apostolica.*[2]

[1] He was made deacon and priest in one day at the early age of twenty-one.

[2] The full title is *Harmonia Apostolica, seu, Binæ*

It is difficult to understand in our day how Bull's work was met by such vigorous opposition, and that on the part of some able Churchmen as well as of dissenters. He was accused of departing from the teaching of the Reformers; but he himself maintained that his views were really in accord with the authentic Confessions of the reformed Churches, which he held had been misunderstood and misapplied. The truth is Bull maintained with all our theologians that (1) the moving cause of man's justification is the mercy of God, and (2) that the meritorious cause is solely the satisfaction (the obedience and sufferings) of our Lord. The only question was as to the *condition* required on our part for our justification. Was it faith merely, or faith and repentance, and, if opportunity permitted, faith operative of good works? The discussion is now quite outworn; and I can adopt the language of the acute Bishop Thirlwall with reference to J. H. Newman's *Lectures on Justification* (which, in the main, symbolize with Bull). "After the closest attention given to the subject, I view it as one of words, involving no real difference of opinion." Indeed, with the exception of a few extreme fanatics whose names are now forgotten, those who have been most

Dissertationes quarum in priore doctrina D. Jacobi de justificatione ex operibus explanatur ac defenditur: in posteriore consensus D. Pauli cum Jacobo liquido demonstratur.

eager in contending for "justification by faith alone" have always asserted that "justifying faith" cannot be without repentance, and, if opportunity allows, good works.

It is not on the theological side, but on the side of biblical exegesis that the interest now lies. The relations of the writings of St. James and St. Paul remain a curious problem in the study of the New Testament literature. On that side of the question Bull will not satisfy modern criticism; and I make bold to say much more that is really helpful in the discussion will be found in the short twenty-third lecture of Dr. Salmon's *Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament* than in the once famous treatise of Bishop Bull.[1]

The controversies in which this work involved the author need not here occupy us. His *Examen Censuræ* and *Apologia pro Harmonia* (1676) are of value chiefly in further elucidating his position.

The two other principal works of Bull are concerned with the doctrine of the divinity of Christ. The *Defensio Fidei Nicenæ* (1685) is occupied in showing from a careful examination of the anti-Nicene writers that the faith

[1] Hallam seems to me to much overrate the importance of the *Harmonia Apostolica* when he reckons it "the principal work" in our theological literature of the period 1650—1700.

formulated at the Council of Nicæa was consonant with the teaching of the Church in the first three centuries. He had in view throughout admissions of Petavius as to the unorthodox character of teaching to be found in the early Fathers, which had been eagerly seized upon by Arian and Socinian writers. A later work, the *Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ* (1694), was written against those who, professing themselves to believe in the *truth* of the Nicene doctrine, argued that nevertheless after the example (as they alleged) of the anti-Nicene Church an acceptance of that truth should not be made one of the terms of church communion; and that consequently the Nicene Council, though right as to the doctrine defined, was unjustified in adding an anathema to the definition. Both of these discussions are conducted by an elaborate examination of anti-Nicene history and literature; and on the interesting and difficult subject of anti-Nicene Christology no student can afford to dispense with the aid to be found in Bull's writings.

The value of the first of these two works was recognized by the University of Oxford conferring on the author (who had never graduated even in Arts) the degree of Doctor of Divinity. The second obtained a more remarkable distinction, in a message from the great Bossuet conveying to him "the sincere congratulations of the whole of the clergy of France."

More has perhaps been made of the complimentary language of Bossuet (which occurs in an informal letter addressed to the pious layman, Robert Nelson[1]) than it deserves. But, however this may be, the astute author of *L'Histoire des Variations*, while conveying his praises of the *Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*, requests that Bull would inform him what he meant by the phrase *Eglise Catholique*. "Estce l'Eglise Romaine," he writes, "et celles qui luy adherent? Estce l'Eglise Anglicane? Estce un amas confus de societez separées les unes des autres?" To these questions of Bossuet Bull replied in his work on *The corruptions of the Church of Rome in relation to ecclesiastical government, the rule of faith, and form of divine worship, in answer to the Bishop of Meaux's queries*. The death of Bossuet prevented his receiving this reply, but the work remains a powerful indictment of Rome from an acknowledged master of the literature of the early Church. Bull expresses some surprise that Bossuet could have for a moment supposed it possible that by "the Catholic Church" he had meant the Church of Rome, when in the *Judicium* itself, when speaking of her declension from primitive purity, he had exclaimed in the words of the prophet, *Quomodo effecta est meretrix urbs fidelis!* And he then gives his definition of "the

[1] The letter is printed in Nelson's *Life of Bull* (prefixed to Burton's edition of Bull's *Works*, p. 329).

Catholic Church" as "a collection of all the Churches throughout the world who retain *the faith once* (ἅπαξ) delivered to the saints. . . . All the Churches at this day which hold and profess this faith and religion, however distant in place, or distinguished by different rites and ceremonies, yea, or divided in some extra-fundamental points of doctrine, yet agreeing in the essentials of the Christian religion, make up together one Christian Catholic Church under the Lord Christ, the supreme Head thereof." . . . "A union of all the Churches of Christ throughout the world under one visible head, having a jurisdiction over them all, and that head the Bishop of Rome for the time being . . . was never dreamed of amongst Christians for at least the first six hundred years." . . . "My constant judgment of the Church of Rome hath been, that if she may be allowed still to remain a part or member of the Catholic Church (which hath been questioned by some learned men, upon grounds and reasons not very easy to be answered), yet she is certainly a very unsound and corrupted one, and sadly degenerated from her primitive purity." Bull proceeds to expose in detail what he regards as "corruptions." He boldly declares that most of the "superadded articles of the Trent creed" are "manifest untruths, yea, gross and dangerous errors." We need not follow him in detail; but it may be worth while to indicate the views of this eminent patristic scholar on the Eucharist.

He denies that there is in the Eucharist "an offering up again to God of the very Body and Blood of Christ substantially present under the appearance of bread and wine" (*Works*, ii. 254). He asserts that Christ is offered "commemoratively only"; but adds that "this commemoration is made to God the Father, and is not a bare remembering or putting ourselves in mind of him." . . . "In the holy Eucharist, therefore, we set before God the bread and wine as 'figures or images of the precious blood of Christ shed for us and of His precious body' (they are the very words of the Clementine Liturgy), and plead to God the merit of His Son's sacrifice once offered" (*Ibid.* p. 252). He by express mention accepts Mead's view as exhibited in *The Christian Sacrifice*.[1] And, on another aspect of the Eucharistic controversy, though he does not commit himself, Bull evidently leans to the view, which he attributes to Justin Martyr and Irenæus, that "by or upon the sacerdotal benediction the Spirit of Christ, or a divine virtue from Christ, descends upon the elements and accompanies them to all worthy communicants, and that therefore they are said to be, and are, the Body and Blood of Christ—the same divinity, which is hypostatically united to the Body of Christ in heaven, being *virtually* united to the elements of bread and wine on earth."[2]

[1] See p. 159.

[2] This is, it will be seen, substantially the doctrine of the non-jurors.

The published Sermons of Bishop Bull are only twenty in number, but many of them are really considerable doctrinal treatises, the outcome of careful research, and are well worthy of study.

The activity of the Romish party in England during the reign of Charles II. had excited suspicion and dislike; and when a convert to Rome ascended the throne in the person of his brother, even reasonable men began to fear the consequences. Events speedily proved that their fears were not ill-founded. The arbitrary, illegal, and violent action of James II. in his relations to the Church and the Universities roused the warmest indignation throughout the country. The divines of the Church were quite ready for the emergency, and, so far as well-reasoned argument could go in her defence, the Church had nothing to fear. For some years both before and after James's accession the clergy had taken in hand the popular exposition of the main points of our controversy with Rome. The pulpit was loud in its exposure of Roman pretensions.[1] The press teemed with pamphlets and more elaborate controversial literature. None exerted themselves more earnestly and effectively than those who were reckoned the "High-churchmen" of the day. Among the leading writers of all schools can be reckoned men of recognized

[1] The saintly Bishop Ken drew vast crowds in London to hear his animated and well-reasoned arguments against the Romish aggression.

learning and ability, some already in high station, and many who afterwards attained distinction and eminent place. From among the best known names may be mentioned William Wake (afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury), Dean George Hickes (known at a later date as perhaps the most learned among the early non-jurors), William Lloyd (known to the learned world for his historical researches,[1] and to the public as one of "the Seven Bishops"), William Cave,[2] Symon Patrick (afterwards Bishop of Ely), William Sherlock, Henry Wharton, John Tillotson and Thomas Tenison (afterwards successively Archbishops of Canterbury), Thomas Comber, Edward Stillingfleet, Daniel Whitby, William Clagett, Henry Aldrich (Dean of Christ Church), and Gilbert Burnet.[3] Many of the more valuable

[1] His *Historical account of Church government as it was in Great Britain and Ireland when they first received the Christian religion* was reprinted in 1842.

[2] His *Primitive Christianity* reached a fourth edition in 1682, it was reprinted in 1839 and 1849. *The lives of the Apostles* and *The lives of the most eminent Fathers of the Church* have also been popular. Among his more learned works the most valuable is his very useful *Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum historia literaria*, etc., 2 vols., folio, 1688-98. The best edition is Oxford 1740-43 (superintended by Waterland). It was reprinted *Basil* 1741-45. A new edition with the results of subsequent discovery and research is much needed.

[3] The reputation of few men has suffered more from the rancour of political and ecclesiastical party spirit than that of Burnet. But time has helped to vindicate his merits.

tractates of these authors and others were collected in the next century by Gibson, Bishop of London.[1]

His *History of the Reformation of the Church of England* with its great collection of authentic records deserves a place in every library next to the *Ecclesiastical Memorials* of his contemporary, Strype. In spite of all attempts to depreciate it, his *Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles* is a work of lasting value, and though more recent investigations have done much to supplement it (especially, as by Archdeacon Hardwick, on the historical side), it has not been wholly superseded by any of the numerous recent works on the same subject.

[1] *A Preservative against Popery.* 3 vols., folio, 1738. This was printed in 18 vols. 8vo, 1848–9.

LECTURE VI

Prolonged suspension of the controversy with Rome—Controversy on civil allegiance—The "Bangorian controversy"—The great controversy with the Deists, Bishop Berkeley, Bishop Butler—Warburton's *Divine Legation*—Paley—The controversy with Arianism and Socinianism—Waterland—The Eucharistic theories of the non-jurors—Their views as to the invalidity of Lay-Baptism—Biblical criticism and exegesis in the eighteenth century — Ecclesiastical history — Conclusion.

It remains for us now to make a rapid general survey of the theological literature of the Church of England in the eighteenth century. The subject deserves careful study; and, did time permit, one might well bestow on it a larger consideration than is here possible. It is no doubt true, that as the general literature of England, to whatever cause it may be attributed, showed a singular decline in works of distinctive power and creative energy, so the theological literature of the same period contrasts unfavourably with the works of the earlier writers. Yet having made this acknowledgment, one cannot but regret that there has been a tendency to unduly

underrate the labours of the eighteenth century, and to regard contemptuously an epoch that did much valuable, if not very brilliant work.

The most noticeable feature of the theology of this period, when contrasted with that which preceded it, lies in the fact that our divines were no longer directly concerned in polemics with Rome. They were mainly engaged in a yet more momentous conflict—the struggle with various forms of unbelief, and more particularly disbelief in a supernatural revelation.

The Revolution settlement had removed the more pressing and urgent fears of Romish aggression upon our liberties, civil and religious. On its literary side the controversy with Rome seemed, as it were, suddenly extinguished. The engagement had been long, and of varied fortune; but political events practically closed the campaign on its literary side. As it turned out, the band of Anglican pamphleteers in the reign of James II. fired the last volley; and for a century and a half the old enemy made no appearance in the field of Anglican controversy. If I may trust my memory, there was not produced during the whole of the eighteenth century so much as even one considerable treatise directed against the ecclesiastical pretensions or dogmatic errors of Rome. The civil government passed several stringent, and even harsh, legislative enactments against "Papists"; and the mass of the English people settled down to a

contented and, very generally, unintelligent Protestantism, mostly quiescent, but occasionally roused into passion, when stirred by some dread of political change. The clergy, whether "high-church" or "low-church," whether members of the ecclesiastical establishment or non-jurors, were all united in their strong and steady aversion from Rome and Romanism.

For many years after the flight of James II. the clergy were much distracted by controversies arising out of questions of conscience connected with the subject of political allegiance. It is only unthinking persons who can make light of the difficult moral problems which originated in the imposition of the oath of allegiance and, afterwards, of the oath of abjuration. Good and able men solved the problems in different ways; and it would be a mistake to assume that the noble self-sacrifice of those who declined the oaths makes any presumption in favour of the soundness of their judgment. With the unreasoning the man who *suffers* for his convictions is too often reckoned to be necessarily in the right. But the combination of honest convictions with stupidity, or with erroneous theories, is common enough. And the political conceptions of the non-jurors, if examined in the light of modern thought, would perhaps scarcely stand the test of sound reason. At any rate, to make a belief in the indefeasible rights of hereditary monarchy an article of ecclesias-

tical communion was a melancholy and fatal mistake.

On the controversies arising out of the question of civil allegiance and the position of the deprived bishops a vast quantity of pamphlet literature issued from the press. It was often marked by much embittered feeling, and for a time distracted many good men from more profitable studies.

The Sacheverell sermon and its political consequences further accentuated differences which had arisen within the bounds of the Church established, and a few years later the flood-gates of party animosity were flung wide in the "Bangorian controversy." This acrimonious strife originated in the extreme and dangerous latitudinarian notions as to the character and constitution of "the Kingdom of Christ," propounded in a sermon published (1717) by Hoadly, Bishop of Bangor. Feeling ran high and was largely intensified by the jealousies of the political parties of the day. A crowd of pamphleteers engaged in the literary fray, and it is said that some two hundred publications on the questions in debate have been counted. On the side of Church principles no one distinguished himself more than **William Law**, whose *Serious Call* and *Christian Perfection* continue to be highly esteemed among works of a practical and devotional kind. "In mere dialectical skill," writes one whose sympathies and violent pre-

judices are not on the side of William Law,[1] "he had very few superiors. That he was more than once victorious over Hoadly no candid Whig can deny." This controversy, though now forgotten, was not idle or frivolous. It concerned principles of essential and permanent importance.

But the main intellectual force of the Church was concerned with a controversy that cut far deeper into life than questions as to civil allegiance, and the permissible measures of ecclesiastical latitude. A succession of writers, some of whom were men of no mean ability, attempted openly or, as was more common, under a thin disguise of professed orthodoxy, to undermine the very foundations of the Christian faith. In the preceding century the writings of Hobbes, as we have seen, had been rightly measured as distinctly anti-christian, if not really atheistic, in their tendency. And, earlier than Hobbes, Lord Herbert of Cherbury, in works of much ability, had sounded the key-note which ruled all the deistical writings of the eighteenth century, viz. *the sufficiency of natural religion.*[2]

[1] Lord Macaulay.

[2] The divergence of the faith of Lord Edward Herbert from that of his brother George, the saintly poet, reminds one of the similar phenomenon of our own time in the religious histories of the brothers Newman, and the brothers Froude.

Towards the close of the seventeenth century the need of an apologetic literature was distinctly felt. The pious **Charles Leslie**, formerly Chancellor of Connor Cathedral, and afterwards a nonjuror, published in 1694 his *Short and easy method with the Deists*, a work which attained great popularity. He was followed on the other side by a fellow-countryman of much ability, John Toland, whose *Christianity not mysterious* appeared in 1696. And, as time went by, the positive thesis of the sufficiency of natural religion was accompanied, as was absolutely necessary if the thesis were to be maintained, by attacks on the authenticity of the Scripture histories, and more particularly on the miraculous element in them. In truth in the deistical controversy of the last century, we have an anticipation of one of the most important controversies of our own age. New aspects of the debate have been presented, some new features have come into view ; but any one who desires to face the attack of our nineteenth-century unbelief should familiarize himself with both the attack and defence of the preceding age.

Among any considerable body of writers engaged in a controversy that interests the public there will always be some who are silly and incompetent. Whether the writers pose as the antagonists, or as the champions of orthodoxy, it is inevitable that some will be pretentious weaklings ; and it is probable that the party will be

attended by one or more buffoons. But by these its strength must not be measured. And there can be no greater mistake than to depreciate the ability of the leading writers among the English deists. The splendid powers of the great sceptics of a later generation, Hume and Gibbon, none can venture to despise; but even such writers as Toland and Tindal, Collins, Morgan, Shaftesbury, and Bolingbroke, cannot be lightly dismissed. Nor did the Church of England in their day lightly dismiss them. In fact there is scarcely a writer of any distinction for the first fifty years of the century who did not contribute something, whether essay or sermon, pamphlet or elaborate treatise, to the controversy with the deists. To one or other of Toland's works replies were made, among others, by Dr. Samuel Clarke, Bishop Peter Brown, the metaphysician, and Thomas Brett, the learned non-juror. Anthony Collins was answered, directly or indirectly, by Bishop Chandler, Bishop Gastrell, Bishop Hoadly, Bishop Sherlock, and, with incomparable learning and wit, by Richard Bentley under the guise of *Phileleütherus Lipsiensis*.[1] The coarse attack of Woolston on the miracles of our Lord received replies from Bishop Gibson, Bishop Smalbroke, and Bishop Zachary Pearce. Tindal's *Christianity as old as the Creation* was met by Waterland, Law,

[1] Bentley, as a young man, had won his spurs by his Boyle Lectures (the first of that long series) on *The folly of atheism and* (*what is now called*) *deism*, 1692.

and Conybeare (then Rector of Exeter College), Bishop of Bristol ; and the other minor deistical writers were not disregarded.[1]

The general questions at issue were discussed with much power and exquisite grace and freshness in a work composed on the western side of the Atlantic, in his "alcove" near Newport, in Rhode Island, by **George Berkeley**, shortly afterwards to be elevated to the see of Cloyne.[2] It is of no common interest to observe that in this work, *Alciphron or the Minute Philosopher*, written on American soil, we have "the germ of the whole argument"[3] of the greatest of all Christian Apologetics, **Butler's** immortal *Analogy of Religion, natural and revealed, to the constitution and course of Nature* (1736).

The *Analogy* was the outcome of years of quiet meditation in a country parsonage. The great controversy had long occupied the author's thoughts ; but it was probably Tindal's *Chris-*

[1] See Leland's *View of the principal deistical writers . . . and some account of the answers*, etc., 4th edition, 1764, 2 vols. 8vo.

[2] Beside Leland's well-known *View* the student may consult Lecture III. in Dr. John Cairns' excellent work on *Unbelief in the Eighteenth Century* (1881) and Lechler's *Geschichte des Englischen Deismus* (1841). From the side sympathetic with unbelief the subject is treated in Leslie Stephen's *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, 2nd edit., 1881.

[3] According to a most competent judge, the late Bishop (W. Fitzgerald) of Killaloe. See his life of Butler prefixed to his admirable edition of the *Analogy*, p. xxxvii.

tianity as old as the Creation (1730) that had the high distinction of being the immediate occasion that called it forth. It was not of Butler's method to name the authors whose principles he contests, but it is certain that upon this book Butler constantly keeps his eye.[1]

But our obligations to Butler do not end with the *Analogy*. His services to Christian ethics in his *Sermons* are of the highest order. Nowhere else do we find so complete, so convincing, and, let me add, so stimulating and inspiring a demonstration of that cardinal truth of practical religion, the supremacy of conscience in the system of human nature. Apart, too, from their intellectual force, the *Sermons* reveal to us what we should not have otherwise guessed, that Butler possessed a depth and ardour of *feeling* which is not always combined with great powers of close and accurate reasoning. When one has read Butler's two wonderful sermons on *The Love of God* he is tempted to apply to him words used (I shall not venture to say how truly) of Goethe—"His *heart*, which few know, was as great as his *intellect*, which all know."

It is wholly impossible to present in a few words any just estimate of the extraordinary work upon which the reputation of **Warburton** chiefly rests—*The Divine Legation of Moses*. No writing of the century attracted such general

[1] Bishop Fitzgerald, *ut supr.* p. xxxvi.

attention, or roused more conflicting sentiments. To base the supernatural character of the Mosaic legislation on the assumption, or, if you will, the fact, that it ignored the sanctions of a future state of rewards and punishments, was as offensive to many Christians as it was startling and perplexing to unbelievers. The work is disfigured indeed by much intellectual arrogance. But despite the malevolent detraction of some and the, scarcely less injurious, extravagant laudations of others, *The Divine Legation* must always remain a monument of the extraordinary abilities of the author. Whatever may now be thought of the paradox which it so ingeniously maintained, none can fail to wonder at the striking originality, the wide and curious, if not always very accurate, learning, the power of imaginative prognostic, and the dialectical skill so bountifully exhibited.

The closing years of the century brought into prominence the name of **Paley**. His *Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy* (1785), based on utilitarian doctrine, was in its day extremely popular.[1] The *Horæ Paulinæ* (1790) was, in my judgment, his greatest work. It is an argument conducted in the true spirit of historical criticism; and whatever may be thought of some few details, the general effect is with reasonable minds convincing and final. The *View of the Evidences of Christianity* (1794) attained an even

[1] In 1803 the 14th edition made its appearance.

greater popular success. Its real merits are unquestionable; but in several parts it lies much more open to hostile criticism than the *Horæ Paulinæ*. Paley's last important work, his *Natural Theology* (1802), brings us within the confines of the present century. Its characteristic merit is the force and lucidity with which it exhibits, in particular examples, the argument from design in nature. Recent speculations as to the doctrine of Evolution and the Origin of Species may demand a new *setting* (so to speak) of the argument, and a readjustment of certain positions; but the argument itself must remain potent and convincing as long as man remains a rational creature.

The eighteenth century has been styled the *ævum rationalisticum;*[1] and the Church may accept the designation without fear of reproach, for, discarding appeals to authority, she feared not to meet her opponents on their own ground. After all has been said, human reason, understanding thereby the whole complex nature of man's spiritual being, must of necessity be for man the ultimate arbiter of truth and falsehood. The century began with Samuel Clarke's *Being and Attributes of God* (1704) and his *Discourse concerning the unchangeable obligations of natural religion and the truth and certainty of the Christian Revelation* (1705); it ended with Paley's treatises on the same subjects. The eighteenth century

[1] By Cave.

was in England the age of the Christian Apologists.[1]

Turning now to lesser, though yet most vital controversies, the lapse in the beginning of the century of some of the leading clergy of the Church into Arianism called out the learning and masculine powers of Waterland; at a later period **William Jones**, of Nayland, did useful work; and towards the close of the century **Bishop Horsley**, a master of clear and powerful reasoning, triumphantly encountered Priestley, the able leader of the Socinians.

In the beginning of the century **Waterland** was the most considerable theologian. His *Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist as laid down in Scripture and Antiquity* is commonly reckoned among the classics of English theology; and certainly no one is entitled to pretend to a knowledge of what can be said on behalf of the teaching of the best-known of our divines on this subject, who has not thoroughly mastered Waterland. Another admirable specimen of Waterland's scholarly method will be found in his *Critical History of the Athanasian Creed;*

[1] One must gratefully remember the services done for Christian apologetics by divines who were not members of the Church of England, such as Leland, Samuel Chandler, Doddridge, and, above all, Nathaniel Lardner, whose *Credibility of the Gospel History* is acknowledged on all hands as a work of distinguished excellence. It acquired a high reputation in Germany and France as well as at home.

and though there have been several interesting contributions in our own day towards the historical inquiry into the origin of this Creed, it may be questioned whether any of these have seriously affected Waterland's conclusions.

It was about this time that a certain school of divines, chiefly non-jurors, gave currency to views upon the Eucharist differing very considerably from the more generally accepted doctrine. The chief exponent of these views was one who was not himself a non-juror, **John Johnson** (1662—1725), Vicar of Cranbrook in Kent. In 1714 (2nd Part, 1717) appeared his elaborate treatise, *The unbloody sacrifice and altar unveiled and supported.* The views here expressed were advocated with, occasionally, unimportant variations by the leading non-jurors, English and Scottish, among whom may be named the non-juring Bishops, Hickes (deprived Dean of Worcester), Archibald Campbell, Jeremy Collier, Thomas Brett (editor of the *Collection of the Principal Liturgies . . . particularly the ancient, viz. the Clementine, etc.*, 1720), Thomas Deacon, Thomas Rattray (editor of *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem*, 1744), and Robert Forbes. Substantially the same doctrinal views were maintained by **Samuel Seabury** (1729—1796), first Bishop of the Church in the United States of America, and in the States are still, it would seem, largely prevalent.[1] It is only

[1] Seabury was ordained Deacon and Priest (1753) by

the grossest ignorance that can confound the doctrine of the non-juring school with the Roman dogma. Its main characteristic is the emphasis it lays on the bread and wine, after they have been made, by the words of Institution, "authoritative *symbols* or *representations* of Christ's crucified Body and shed Blood," being *offered* in the Eucharist to God the Father. *After* this has been done it was proper and (according to some) essential that there should be an *expressed prayer of Invocation* that God would send the Holy Spirit upon the bread and wine, that, "to all spiritual interests and purposes," they may become, "in power and effect," the Body and Blood of Christ. The bread and wine remain what they were in themselves, but "in power and effect" they are the Body and Blood of Christ, that is, "they are full and authentic *substitutes* for them," and for spiritual purposes are their "*equivalents*." The Body and Blood of Christ are not *in* or *under* the forms of bread and wine; the bread and wine *are* "the sacramental Body and Blood of Christ," because they convey the *benefits* of the natural Body and Blood to those who worthily receive it.

These views met with little acceptance in the

---

the Bishop of Carlisle, at Fulham, and consecrated Bishop in 1784, at Aberdeen. His teaching on the Eucharist may be gathered from his *Discourses* and, particularly, his *Earnest Persuasive to Frequent Communion*, 1789.

Church of England, partly, no doubt, because the non-juring theory of consecration required an express epiklesis, or verbal invocation of the Holy Spirit, which is certainly absent from the authorized form of the English Prayer-book.[1] The influence of Waterland[2] was also thrown into the scale against the non-juring school.[3] In our own day the eucharistic doctrine of the non-jurors has been scornfully denounced, by some who arrogate to themselves the name of "Catholics," as teaching the doctrine of the "Real Absence."

A minor controversy, carried on with no small acrimony, broke out in the early part of the century on the subject of the validity of lay-baptism. It seems to have been originated by two distinguished Irishmen, both non-jurors, Charles Leslie and Henry Dodwell. The latter, a learned layman, who had been a Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, and afterwards Camden

[1] When the American Church framed its Liturgy, it to a large extent followed the Scottish Communion Office and the majority of the ancient Liturgies, where the words of Institution come first, then the Oblation, and lastly the Invocation.

[2] See p. 200.

[3] His very acute, if not conclusive criticism of Johnson will be found in the Appendix to *The Christian sacrifice explained* in his *Works*, V., pp. 150—184. The best succinct account of the non-jurors' doctrine will be found in the *Shorter Catechism*, contained in Deacon's *Full, true, and comprehensive view of Christianity* (1734).

Professor at Oxford, propounded (1706) the extraordinary notion that the souls of men are naturally mortal and are "immortalized" through baptism, but only when that baptism is administered by persons episcopally ordained. In this extravagant view Dodwell appears to have been singular. But the non-jurors generally accepted the view that the rite administered by any not episcopally ordained was not Christian baptism, or, otherwise expressed, was invalid.

Up to this period there was no question among the leading divines of the Church of England as to the *validity* of lay-baptism. Down to the revision of the Prayer-book in 1604 lay-baptism was distinctly recognized. After that date, while regarded as *irregular*, it was not judged to be *invalid*. The well-known principle, *fieri non debet, sed factum valet*, was supposed to apply to such cases. The study of the Offices for Private Baptism (text and rubrics) as now used in the Churches of England, Ireland, Scotland, the United States, and the British colonies, will probably be regarded as leaving little doubt that this is the mind of the Anglican Communion. In the case of the Church of England the decisions of the Ecclesiastical Courts have for practical purposes set the matter at rest.[1]

[1] The Scottish Church, while in the last century following the rigorist view of the non-jurors, has in the present century followed other counsels. And her judgment on

In the beginning of the last century the views entertained by the non-jurors were adopted by some of the clergy of the Established Church. Some of the Tory clergy, filled with dread at "comprehensive" schemes, hailed this doctrine as a new weapon against their enemies, the dissenters. Bingham with great learning supported the validity of lay-baptism. Waterland, with greater argumentative power, lent his aid to the newer view. A number of less distinguished writers engaged in the fray. But after some years of struggle the matter came to be practically settled by the non-jurors generally adopting the view of the invalidity of lay-baptism, and the clergy of the Church of England retaining the view of her earlier theologians, and of the Church generally both Eastern and Western.[1]

---

the subject may be sufficiently gathered from the following words of her present Code of Canons (1890)—"When a person who applies to be admitted into the Communion of this Church shall express a doubt of the validity of the baptism which he has received, the Clergyman to whom the application is made shall, *unless he be satisfied that the proper matter and form of words have been used at such baptism*, baptize the person in the form of words prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer in cases of doubt: 'If thou art not already baptized,' etc." (Canon xxxviii. § 4). See also *Lay-Baptism valid—the doctrine of the Episcopal Church in Scotland: a Charge delivered to the clergy of the Diocese of Edinburgh* (1888).

[1] Roger Laurence, then a non-juring layman, wrote a treatise on "Lay-Baptism invalid" (1710), which was at the time much esteemed. On the other side may be

A few words must be said, before concluding, of the services done during the century for sacred and ecclesiastical learning outside the circles of apologetics and doctrinal controversy.

In biblical criticism and exegesis comparatively little was done. But there were honourable exceptions to the prevailing want of interest on this subject. The labours of some thirty years, concluded only fourteen days before his death, gave the world in 1707 the critical edition of the text of the New Testament by **John Mill**, Principal of St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford. The greatest living authority on the textual criticism of the New Testament, Bishop Westcott, declares that this work "marks an epoch in the history of the New Testament text," and, "when every drawback has been made . . . remains a splendid monument of the labours of a life." Not unlike the case of Brian Walton, the various readings collected by Mill (said to be 30,000 in number) were treated by Whitby (himself a man of ability and learning) as unsettling the text of Scripture, and, in another quarter, were made much of by the Deists for the purpose of discrediting the authority of the Scriptures. **Bentley**, as *Phileleutherus Lipsiensis*, made a brilliant reply. He himself indeed had made

---

mentioned the admirable treatise of Bishop Fleetwood. An account of the general controversy (useful though not altogether impartial) may be found in Mr. Elwin's *The Minister of Baptism* (1889), pp. 224—241.

considerable preparations for the restoration of the text "exactly as it was in the best examples at the time of the Council of Nice." But this prince of textual critics was forced by the miserable distractions of his life to abandon his design. Nothing more in this region of inquiry was effected in England till our own time.[1]

In biblical exegesis the century had little to boast. Whitby's Commentaries on the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles, continued during the last century, and indeed for many years of the present century, to be held in much esteem; but they have been since superseded.

It may be questioned whether we are entitled to reckon John Ernest Grabe, a learned German settled in England, as an Anglican divine; but, at any rate, he contributed to our theological learning an edition of the Septuagint from the text of the Codex Alexandrinus (Oxon., 1707, 4 vols. folio). Two years before the publication of these volumes Humphrey Hody's learned work, *De Bibliorum textibus originalibus, etc.*, had appeared, dealing largely with questions connected with the Septuagint.

In Hebrew scholarship the impression made by **Bishop Lowth's** *Prælectiones de sacra poesi Hebræorum* (1753) was considerable. It was soon after (1758) reprinted at Goettingen, with additions by J. D. Michælis. This work has

[1] Whitby's *Examen variantium lectionum J. Millii* is generally found at the end of his *Commentary*.

gone through several editions, both in Latin and in an English translation.

Dean Humphrey Prideaux's *Connection of the Old and New Testaments* (1716—1718) went through many editions, the 25th (edited by Dr. McCaul) appearing as late as 1858. It is both learned and interesting.

The published results of patristic studies were few, and are confined almost wholly to the early part of the century. Fell's *Cyprian* (1682) belongs to the previous age. But we may mention Potter's fine edition of *Clement of Alexandria* (1715), a work that has commanded the respect of scholars both at home and abroad. Grabe edited Irenæus (1702), and, afterwards, some fragments attributed to this Father (1715). Thirlby's *Justin Martyr* (1722), the Oxford edition of *Ephraem Syrus* (1709), and Reading's issue of Valesius' edition of the Greek Ecclesiastical Historians (1720) may also be mentioned. But the study of Christian antiquity had already begun to languish.

It would be indeed ungrateful not to recognize the merits of **Joseph Bingham's** invaluable *Origines Ecclesiasticæ, or the Antiquities of the Christian Church* (1708—1722), an admirable piece of work, executed under such difficulties as attend remoteness from great libraries, narrow means, and infirm health. Though much has been done in our own day in the study of Christian Antiquities, Bingham's volumes are

still essential in the library of every clergyman. Nor should one forget the elaborate *History of infant baptism* (1705) by **William Wall** and his *Defence* of his *History* (1720), in which the belief and practice of the ancient Church are exhibited with great fulness.[1]

To the study of the history of the Church in Great Britain and Ireland a splendid contribution was made in **David Wilkins'** monumental work, the *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ* (4 vols. folio, 1737), which has been superseded, but only for the early period, by the, unfortunately, incompleted work of Haddan and Stubbs. In this connection may be mentioned Gibson's useful *Codex juris ecclesiastici Anglicani* (1713).[2]

The pre-Reformation history of the Church of England had been illustrated by Henry Wharton in his *Anglia Sacra* (1691), and a valuable and, for the time, highly creditable attempt to cover the whole field of English Church history down to the end of the reign of Charles II. was made by **Jeremy Collier** in his *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain* (1708—1714).[3] The period of the Reformation was dealt with by **Gilbert Burnet**, who, whatever were his prejudices (and

[1] The best edition is Cotton's (1836), 4 vols.

[2] The second edition, 2 vols. folio, 1761, is much enlarged and improved.

[3] The best edition is that edited by Lathbury, 9 vols. 8vo., 1852.

they have been often made too much of), left in the third volume of his *History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, a valuable body of documents from authentic sources.[1] Another worthy labourer in the same field was his contemporary, **John Strype**, whose numerous historical works contain a great collection of materials relating to the Church and its eminent men from the Reformation to the reign of James I.

In bringing to a close this rapid survey of a great literature, extending over two centuries and a half, the lecturer feels like one who has undertaken to act as *cicerone* of a six-hours tour around and through some large historic city. The multitude of details cannot but be somewhat confusing to one who is new to the place; but the sights of interest, it is hoped, may tempt him to prolong his stay and make a closer acquaintance with what he has seen. We have viewed the encircling line of the town's defensive works, and noticed the frowning fronts of the great fortresses that have been erected from time to time, and have again and again resisted the assaults of hostile armies. We have passed rapidly through the main avenues and principal streets, and observed the more striking features of the city's architecture,—royal palaces, courts

[1] The first vol. appeared in 1679, the second in 1681, and the third in 1715.

of law, houses of legislature, museums, galleries, churches. Here and there a passing glimpse has been obtained of pleasant parks and gardens bright with flowers. Have we not seen enough to satisfy us that here is indeed a goodly heritage?—And this goodly heritage is ours. May I not hope that some, at least, of my younger brethren may be tempted to return, and make a fuller and more leisurely acquaintance with its wonders and its treasures. I can promise them delight as well as instruction. Even the very lanes and alleys, which we have not entered, conceal many an historic monument that will repay their research.

But you will ask—"Do such studies bear upon the life and the questions of to-day?" I answer emphatically "Yes." There is no large question of current interest, no matter of present debate in the religious world which has not, in *essence and principle*, been dealt with by the great masters of the past. Look how, even in the field of physical contests, where the conditions of warfare have of late been really and materially altered, our great generals devote their time and energies to study the strategy of the campaigns of Cæsar, of Marlborough, of Wellington, of Napoleon. Much more will the advantage of such studies be apparent in the warfare of the world of intellect. Here there has been no discovery of new agencies of destruction, or of new arms of precision. Am-

bitious ecclesiastical pretensions, untruth, false doctrine, heresy, unbelief have forged no weapon which was not known to our forefathers. There may here and there be some shifting in the line of attack, or some new formation of troops; but those who know the masters of the past will, I am confident, have no difficulty in meeting the altered tactics.

"The Lord hath done great things for us." It was in the wisdom He imparted and the courage He inspired that the walls of our city were rebuilded in troublous times, when the great men and our fathers with one hand wrought in the work and with one hand held a weapon. It was in the courage He inspired and the wisdom He imparted that the four walls of the city were fortified without, and within the temple was builded. It was in His wisdom and strength that the battles of former times were fought and won. "Yea, the Lord hath done great things for us already, whereof we rejoice." And the knowledge of the past will help us to look forward with hope, nay rather with confidence, to the future.

INDEX

Admonition to the Parliament, 49
Second Admonition, 50
Aldrich, H., 154, 187
Allen, William, Cardinal, 31
American Prayer-book, 161, 203
Ames, W., 153
Andrewes, Lancelot, 81-93
Aquinas, method of the *Summa*, 4
Atterbury, Francis, vi

Bacon, Lady Anne, 24
Bancroft, Archbishop, 28
Bangorian controversy, 192
Barlow, T., 96
Baron (Baro), Peter, 66
Barrow, Isaac, 175-9
Barry, Bishop, 58
Bellarmine, Cardinal, 65, 74, 82, 83
Benedictines of St. Maur, 2
Benson, Archbishop, quoted, 10
Bentley, R., 173, 195, 206
Berkeley, George, vi, 196
Beveridge, William, 145
Bilson, T., 32-6, 53-4 70
Bingham, Joseph, 208
Blunt, J. J., 29
Bossuet, 5, 182-3
Bramhall, J., 46, 138-9, 161
Brett, Thomas, 195, 201
Broughton, Hugh, 69
Brown, Peter, vi, 195
Bull, George, 161, 179-186
Bullinger's *Decades* falls into disrepute, 66
Burgon, Dean, quoted, 19
Burnet, Gilbert, 175, 187, 209
Butler, Joseph, 196

Cairns, J., 196
Calvinism, 64-70
Cambridge Platonists, 166-170
Campbell, Archibald, 201
Campian, Edmund, 65
Cartwright, Thomas, 42, 50, 105
Castell, Edmund, 142
Casuistry, 151
Cave, W., 187, 199
Chandler, E., 195
Chandler, S., 200
Cheke, Sir John, 11
Chillingworth, W., 118-123, 162
Church, Dean, 55, 86
Clagett, W., 187
Clarke, S., 195, 199
Cole, Henry, 22
Coleridge, S. T., 77, 126, 132, 135
Collier, Jeremy, 201, 209
Comber, T., 187
Constantius, Marcus Antonius, a pseudonym of Stephen Gardiner, 18
Cooper, Thomas, 52
Cosin, John, 136-138
Crakanthorp, R., 95-6
Cranmer, Thomas, 9-20
Cudworth, Ralph, 161, 166, 170
Culverwel, Nathaniel, 171

Davenant, John, 70
Davenport, Christopher, 133
Deacon, T., 201, 203
De Dominis, Marcantonio, 94
Doddridge, P., 200
Dodwell, H., 203
Donne, John, v, 5
Dort, Synod of, 68, 163

Fell, John, 139, 208
Field, Richard, 77-81, 160
Fisher, *i. e.* Percy, 114, 118
Fitzgerald, Bishop W., 150, 196, 197
Fleetwood, Bishop, 206
Forbes, A. P., 174
Forbes, John, vi
Forbes, R., 201
Forbes, William, vi
Fulke, William, 41
Fuller, Thomas, 72, 136

Gardiner, S. R., 112, 116
Gardiner, Stephen, 13, 18
Gastrell, F., 195
Gibson, Edmund, 188, 195, 209

Grabe, J. E., 207

Haddan, A. W., 99, 147, 209
Hales, John, 162-166
Hall, Joseph, 65, 123-5, 156
Hallam, Henry, cited, 73, 158, 181
Hammond, Henry, 139-141
Harding, T., 22, 25-28
Hardwick, Archdeacon, 64, 66
Herbert, Lord Edward, 193
Herbert, George, 98, 193
Hickes, George, 187, 201
Hoadly, B., 192, 195
Hoady, H., 207
Hobbes, T., 139, 193
Hooker, Richard, 36-40, 55-64
Hooper, John, 17
Horsley, S., 200

Jackson, Thomas, 95-99
Jewel, John, 20-30
Johnson, John, 201
Jones, W., 99, 200

Ken, Thomas, vi, 186
King, Archbishop, vi

Lambeth Articles, the, 66
Lardner, N., 200
Latimer, Hugh, 9
Latitude-men, 170
Laud, William, 115-18, 160
Laurence, Richard, 113
Laurence, Roger, 205
Law, W., 192
Leighton, Archbishop, vi
Leland, J., 200
Leslie, Charles, 194, 203
Lightfoot, John, 143-5
Lightfoot, J. B., 103, 174
Lloyd, W., 187
Lowth, R., 207

Martin, Gregory, 41
Martin Mar-prelate tracts, 52
Mason, Francis, 93
Mead, Joseph, 159, 185
Mill, John, 206
Montagu, Richard, 94, 110-14
More, Henry, 166, 170

"Nag's Head" fable, 93
Nash, Thomas, 52
Neale, John Mason, cited, 95

Overall, John, 22, 68

Paley, W., 199
Parker, Matthew, 48
Patrick, Symon, 161, 187
Pearce, Z., 195
Pearson, John, 165, 171-5
Perkins, W., 152

Phileleutherus Lipsiensis, 195, 206
Pococke, Edward, 143
Potter, J., 208
Prideaux, H., 208
Puritanism, character of, 44-46
Pusey, E. B., cited, 131

Quinquarticular controversy, 68

Rainoldes, John, 72-77
Rainoldes, William, 73
Rattray, Thomas, 201
Ridley, Nicholas, 9, 15-17

Sacheverell, 192
Salmon, George, 181
Sancta Clara. *See* Davenport
Sanderson, R. 153-6
Saville, Sir H., 100, 110
Scaliger, Joseph, 73
Scottish Prayer-book, 160, 203
Seabury, Samuel, 201
Sheldon, Archbishop, 144
Sherlock, T., 195
Sherlock, W., 187
Smalbroke, R., 195
Smith, John, 166, 169
Smith, Richard, 12
South, R., vi
Southey, Robert, cited, 98
Stillingfleet, E., 148-157, 187
Strype, J., 144, 210
Stubbs, Bishop, 209

Taylor, Jeremy, 125-136, 156
Tenison, T., 187
Thirlby, Styan, 208
Thorndike, H., 146-8
Tillotson, J., 187
Travers, Walter, 56, 105
Tulloch, John, 63, 123, 132, 171

Ussher, James, 99-108

Wake, W., 187
Wall, W., 209
Walton, Brian, 141, 206
Warburton, W., 197
Ward, Thomas, 42
Waterland, Daniel, 161, 195, 200, 203, 205
Westcott, B. F., 75, 171, 206
Wharton, H., 187, 209
Whewell, Dr. W., 154
Whichcote, B., 166-7
Whitaker, William, 65
Whitby, D., 187, 206
White, Francis, 114
Whitgift, John, 50-52
Wilkins, D., 209
Wilson, Thomas, vi
Wordsworth, Christopher, Bp., 96, 155
Worthington, John, 171

PUBLICATIONS

OF THE

Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

The Analogy of Religion, natural and revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature: to which are added, Two Brief Dissertations: i. Of Personal Identity; ii. Of the Nature of Virtue. By BISHOP BUTLER. 8vo, cloth boards. *2s. 6d.*

A Critical History of the Athanasian Creed. By DANIEL WATERLAND, D.D. 8vo, limp cloth. *2s.*

A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life. Adapted to the State and Condition of all orders of Christians. By WILLIAM LAW, M.A. 12mo, cloth boards. *2s. 6d.*

A Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy, to which is added a Discourse concerning the Unity of the Church. By ISAAC BARROW, D.D. Demy 8vo, cloth boards. *6s.*

The Corruptions of the Church of Rome in relation to Ecclesiastical Government, the Rule of Faith, and Form of Divine Worship: in answer to the Bishop of Meaux's Queries. By BISHOP BULL, with a Preface and Notes by the Rev. T. P. PANTIN. Fcap. 8vo, limp cloth. *1s.*

Contemplations on the Historical Passages of the Old and New Testaments. By BISHOP HALL. Royal 8vo. *6s.*

The Devotions of Bishop Andrewes. Translated from the Greek by DEAN STANHOPE. Fcap. 8vo, large type, cloth boards. *1s.*

The Greek Devotions of Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester. From the Manuscript given by him to WILLIAM LAUD, afterwards ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, and recently discovered. Edited by the Rev. CANON P. G. MEDD, M.A. Small post 8vo, cloth boards. 5*s.*

The Apology of the Church of England. By BISHOP JEWEL. 8vo, cloth boards. 1*s.*

Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity in the form of Question and Answer (an Analysis of the Fifth Book of). By the Rev. GEORGE NELSON, LL.D. Small post 8vo, cloth boards. 2*s.*

A View of the Evidences of Christianity. By WILLIAM PALEY. A New Edition, with Notes, Appendix, and Preface. By the Rev. E. A. LITTON, M.A., Author of "An Essay on Miracles." Post 8vo, cloth boards. 4*s.*

Horæ Paulinæ; or, The Truth of the Scripture History of St. Paul evinced by a Comparison of the Epistles which bear his name with the Acts of the Apostles and with one another. By WILLIAM PALEY. A New Edition, with Notes, Appendix, and Preface. By J. S. HOWSON, D.D., Dean of Chester. Post 8vo, cloth boards. 3*s.*

Paley's Natural Theology. Revised to harmonize with Modern Science. By F. LE GROS CLARK, F.R.S. With illustrations. Post 8vo, cloth bds. 4*s.*

The Golden Grove. By BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR. With Portrait and Memoir. Post 8vo, cloth boards. 1*s.* 4*d.*

LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.;
43, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C.
BRIGHTON: 129, NORTH STREET.

125
ftt

LUTHERAN SEMINARY LIBRARY, MAYWOOD, ILL.

BX5056.D74

Dowden

Theological Literature

18754

DATE	ISSUED TO

BX5056
.D74

Library Bureau | Cat. no 117[illegible]

18754